THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

AUG 14 1959

Presented to
United
Theological Seminary
Library
Dayton, Ohio

by

Harold D. Halderman

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDITED BY

JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T582 47,388

VOLUME THE TWENTY-THIRD.

October 1911–September 1912.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

Printed by

MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON	SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER	JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW	JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK	CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXIII.

AUTHORS.

ISRAEL ABRAHAMS, M.A.— PAGE
John $7^{38.39}$ 180

Rev. FREDERICK BALCH—
Wesley's Doctrine of Assurance . . 345

Professor J. S. BANKS, M.A., D.D.—
The Good and the Beautiful . . 281
The Philocalia of Origen . . . 513

Professor J. AGAR BEET, D.D.—
The Writings of John 449

Rev. J. G. BERRY, M.A.—
Matthew 18^{10} 182

Rev. M. J. BIRKS—
'Mizpah' (Gn 31^{49}) 383

Rev. ROBERT CANDLISH, M.A.—
The Pounds and the Talents . . 136

Professor T. K. CHEYNE, D.Litt., D.D.—
Eshmun and other Divine Names . 136
Psalm 31^{20} 281

Principal J. S. CLEMENS, M.A., D.D.—
Alpha and Omega 285

Rev. EDWARD J. CLIFTON, M.A.—
Watering with the Foot . . . 183

Rev. W. F. COBB, D.D.—
The Gift of Healing in the Church . 30

Rev. ARTHUR DAKIN, B.D., D.Th.—
The Belief in the Miraculous in N.T. Times 37
The Idea underlying the Eschatological Discourses of our Lord . . . 86

Rev. W. HOPE DAVISON, M.A.—
The First Recorded Prayer in the Bible 332

Rev. W. E. ENTWISTLE—
'Wateredst it with thy foot' (Dt 11^{10}) . 331

Rev. GEORGE FARMER, A.K.C.—
The Orante 332

Professor Dr. PAUL FEINE—
Positive Theological Research in Germany 440, 497

Professor J. DICK FLEMING, M.A., D.D.—
The Message of Rudolf Eucken . 249, 322

Rev. G. E. FORD, M.A.—
The Children's Bread and the Dogs . 329

Rev. ROBERT G. FORREST, M.A., D.D.—
The First Prayer in the Bible . . 284

Rev. H. W. FULFORD, M.A.—
2 Thessalonians 2^{7} 40

Rev. W. R. W. GARDNER, M.A.— PAGE
Galatians 4^{31}–5^{1} 330

Principal A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.—
The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds . . 353, 414, 448, 505, 548

Chief Rabbi M. GASTER, Ph.D.—
The Age of Joseph 237

MARGARET D. GIBSON, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.—
Belshazzar's Feast 181
John $7^{38.39}$ 236
Phœbe 281

Rev. FRANK J. GOULD, M.A.—
Unbiblical Views about Biblical Matters 94

Rev. C. LANGTON GURNEY, M.A.—
Watering with the Foot . . . 94

Professor A. C. HADDON, M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S.—
Ethics among Primitive Peoples . . 403

EDWARD HASTINGS—
The Cambridge History of English Literature 25

Rev. ARCHIBALD HENDERSON, M.A., D.D.—
Note on Variant in the Text of Jn 1^{13} . 526

Rev. JAMES HENDRY, M.A.—
Skill 263

Principal H. HIGHFIELD, M.A.—
What kind of Food was it that Tamar made for Amnon? 39
The Interpretation of 2 S 8^{2} . . 40
James 3^{5} . . . A Personal Reminiscence? 40

Professor A. G. HOGG, M.A.—
Christ's Message of the Kingdom . . 566

Professor FRITZ HOMMEL, LL.D., Ph.D.—
The God Ashima of Hamath . . 93
A Postscript 136

Professor T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS, D.Litt.—
A New Word for the Greek Testament 379

Principal J. IVERACH, M.A., D.D.—
New Testament Handbook . . . 564

Professor GEORGE JACKSON, B.A.—
The Missionary Idea in the Gospels . 54

E. E. KELLETT, M.A.—
A Note on 'Power on the Head' . 39

Rev. JOHN KELMAN, M.A., D.D.—
The Pilgrim's Progress . . 18, 122, 157, 326, 424, 464, 510, 534

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AUG 14 1959

PAGE

Professor H. A. A. Kennedy, D.Sc., D.D.—
1 Kings 4^{31} 95
Valentinianism 279

Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E.—
Illustrations of Spiritual Truths, from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' . 128, 458

Stephen H. Langdon, M.A., Ph.D.—
Pir-idri (Ben-Hadad), King of Syria . 68

Professor Robert Law, M.A., D.D.—
Christ's Teaching regarding Divorce . 83

Agnes Smith Lewis, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.—
John $7^{38.\ 39}$ 235

Rev. F. Warburton Lewis, B.A.—
Unbiblical Beliefs on Biblical Matters . 285
The Children's Bread and the Dogs . 430

Rev. R. M. Lithgow—
The Minor Parables, the Metaphors and Similes of the Synoptic Gospels . 537

Professor D. D. Luckenbill, LL.D.—
Hadadezer, King of Syria . . . 282

Canon J. A. MacCulloch, D.D.—
The Scottish Liturgy and the Prayer-Book 477

Rev. W. McCulloch, M.A.—
The Pounds and the Talents . . 382

Professor Robert Mackintosh, M.A., D.D.—
'Peter and John' 93

Professor D. S. Margoliouth, M.A., D.Litt.—
Note on Ecclus 7^{25} 234

Rev. George Margoliouth, M.A.—
The Calendar, the Sabbath, and the Marriage Law in the Geniza-Zadokite Document 362

Rev. A. D. Martin, M.A.—
Psalm 31^{20} 332

Rev. James Matthew, B.D.—
Exact Renderings 137

Rev. W. Marwick, M.A.—
Religion at the Universal Races Congress 42

Professor James Moffatt, D.D., D.Litt.—
Robertson and Plummer on First Corinthians 24
Frankenberg on the Odes of Solomon . 181
Feine's N.T. Theology 502

Rev. W. Montgomery, B.D.—
Dr. Schweitzer on the Interpretation of St. Paul 209

Rev. J. H. Morrison, M.A.—
Our Mother the Worm 330

PAGE

Rev. Cavendish Moxon, B.A.—
The Meaning of Matthew $11^{16\text{-}19}$ . . 237

Professor Eb. Nestle, D.D.—
The Lake of Tiberius 41
Unbiblical Views about Biblical Matters 42
'Grace and Peace' 94
The Revisers' Greek Text of Acts 5^{32} . 95
'Lord' in the A.V. 184
Psalm 31^{20} 184
'The Pinnacle of the Temple' . . 184
'Generation of Vipers' 185
Alpha and Omega 185
The First Prayer in the Bible . . 238
The Earliest Quotation of John $7^{38.\ 39}$. 331
The Fate of the Traitor . . . 331
A New Word for the Greek Testament 332
'The Titles of the Psalms' . . . 383
'Those Holy Mountains' . . . 478
'Sirs, ye are Brethren' . . . 528

T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S.—
Light upon Early Babylonian History . 305
Further Light upon Early Babylonian History 567

Dr. D. Plooij—
The Attitude of the Outspread Hands in Early Christian Literature and Art 199, 265

Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A.—
Studies in Pauline Vocabulary . . 365

Professor F. V. Pratt, M.A.—
Ephesians 1^{6} 331

Rev. Frederick Relton, A.K.C.—
John $7^{38.\ 39}$ 236

Rev. Edward P. Rice, M.A.—
Genesis 41^{24} 381

Rev. J. E. Roberts, M.A., B.D.—
The Raising of Lazarus . . . 461

Professor R. W. Rogers, LL.D.—
Shalmanezer 237

Rev. P. Rose, M.A.—
'Power on the Head' 183

John Ross, M.A.—
Two Aspects of Faith (He 11^{1}) . . 182

Rev. J. M. E. Ross, M.A.—
The Ordering of the Spiritual Life . 217

Professor A. H. Sayce, D.Litt., LL.D., D.D.—
The Jewish Papyri of Elephantinê . 92
The Archæology of the Book of Genesis 167, 275
Recent Biblical and Oriental Archæology 547

Professor C. Anderson Scott, M.A., D.D.—
The Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul 488, 560

Rev. J. A. Selbie, M.A., D.D.— PAGE
The Religion of the Ancient Celts . 220
Two Important Works by Professor König 278
Some Thoughts suggested by the Comparative Study of Religion . . 295

Rev. J. M. Shaw, M.A.—
The Present Theological Situation . 7
The Resurrecting Energy of God . . 309

J. Hunter Smith, M.A.—
The Parable of the Mustard Seed . 428

Eugene Stock, D.C.L.—
Professor Hogg on the Kingdom of God 394

Rev. James Strahan, M.A.—
The Perfect Friendship . . . 70
The Gospel of Hosea 521

Principal J. G. Tasker, D.D.—
Harnack on 1 Co 13 259

Rev. A. Thom, M.A.—
Exodus 20^{7} 380

Rev. J. Thomson, M.A.—
Earthworms 430

Rev. J. C. Todd, M.A.— PAGE
'Do this in Remembrance of Me' . 378

Rev. Arthur S. Tritton, M.A.—
The Greeting in 2 Corinthians . . 181

Rev. C. S. Ward, M.A.—
2 Co 12^{9} in the Revised Version . 39

Rev. Herbert A. Watson, D.D.—
Spiritual Power 150

Rev. A. S. Weatherhead, M.A.—
The Healing of One Deaf and Dumb . 381

Rev. T. H. Weir, B.D., M.R.A.S.—
Matthew 5^{20} 430

Rev. Owen C. Whitehouse, M.A., D.D.—
A Protest against that Chaotic Monstrosity 'Comparative Religion' . 36

Rev. F. R. Whittaker, M.A.—
The Fate of the Traitor . . . 478

Rev. J. A. Wilson, M.A.—
Watering with the Foot . . . 237

Rev. F. W. Worsley, M.A., B.D.—
The Sealed Book of the Apocalypse . 104

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Alpha and Omega . . 185, 285
Angels 182, 491
Antichrist 98
Apocalypse, Sealed Book . . 104
Archæology, Biblical . . . 547
Ark 276
Ashima 93, 136
Assurance 182
,, Wesley's Doctrine . 345
Babylonian History . . 305, 567
,, Religion . . . 244
Baptism 265
Belshazzar 181
Ben-Hadad . . 68, 237, 282
Bible 481
Calendar, Jewish . . . 362
Christ 12, 102
,, Person . . . 505, 549
,, Teaching . . 60, 83
,, Universality . . . 61
Christianity 7, 12, 195, 249, 296 ff., 389, 532
Commentary, Great Text, 14, 63, 124, 161, 203, 253, 300, 349, 400, 444, 492, 541
Comparative Religion 36, 295, 403, 433
Creeds 149, 353, 414, 448, 505, 548
Deluge 276
Divorce, Christ's Teaching . . 83
Doom 529
Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul . . 488, 560
Elephantinê Papyri . . 92, 136
Eschatological Discourses . . 86
Eschatology . . 8 f., 60, 209
Eshmun 93, 136
Ethics among Primitive Peoples . 403

PAGE
Eucken, Message of . 249, 322
Exposition, Notes of Recent, 1, 49, 97, 145, 193, 241, 289, 337, 385, 433, 481, 529
Faith 182, 450
Fatherhood 150
Foreign Theology 90, 278, 502, 564
Forgiveness 3
Fourth Gospel . . . 103, 449
Friendship, The Perfect . . 70
Generation of Vipers . . . 185
Genesis, Archæology . . 167, 275
Geniza-Zadokite Document . 362
Glorying 260
Good and the Beautiful . . 281
Grace 532
Grace and Peace . . . 94
Hadadezer . . . 68, 282
Hands, Outspread . 199, 265, 332
Healing in the Church . . 30
Heaven 491
Heavenly Places . . . 365
Hosea, Gospel 521
Illustrations from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall' . . 128, 458
In Christ 451
Incarnation 392
,, Doctrine in Creeds 353, 414, 448, 505, 548
Israel, Religion 93
Jesus or Christ . . . 12, 102
John 93
,, Writings 449
Joseph 237
Judas Iscariot . . . 331, 478
Kingdom of God . . . 394
Kis 308
Knowledge 261

PAGE
Lazarus, Raising . . . 461
Life 289
Lord in the A.V. . . . 184
Lord's Supper 378
Love 523
Miracles 1, 37, 391
Missionary Idea in the Gospels . 54
Missions 337
Mizpah 383
Mustard Seed 428
Mystery 146, 209
Mysticism 340, 522
Nephîlîm 168
Old Testament, Teaching of . 485
Opis 307
Orante . . . 199, 265, 332
Papyri 92, 136
Parables (Minor), Metaphors and Similes of the Synoptic Gospels 537
Paul . . . 209, 261, 488, 560
Pauline Vocabulary . . . 365
Perfection 5, 435
Peter 93
Phœbe 281
Pilgrim's Progress . 18, 122, 157, 326, 424, 464, 510, 534
Pinnacle 184
Pir-idri . . . 68, 237, 282
Positive Theological Research 440, 497
Pounds, Parable of . . 136, 382
Power on the Head . . 39, 183
Power, Spiritual . . . 150
Prayer, First Bible . 238, 284, 332
Present Theological Situation . 7
Prophecy 10
Propitiation 566

	PAGE
Psalms, Titles	383
Psychology	10
Religion at the Universal Races Congress	42
Resurrecting Energy of God	309
Resurrection	393
Revelation, Book	452
Revival	52
Sargon	308, 567
Satan	490
Scottish Liturgy	477
Sealed Book of the Apocalypse	104
Sermon on the Mount	145
Shalmaneser	237
Skill	263
Society	531
Spiritual Life, Ordering of	217
Stead, W. T.	385
Talents, Parable of	136, 382
Tiberius, Lake of	41
2 Thessalonians	97
Unbiblical Views about Biblical Matters	42, 94, 181, 285
War	337

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Adamson, History of Logic	269
Ainsworth, Thornless World	193
Allen, Missionary Methods	376
Arpee, Armenian Awakening	118
Atlay, Life of Bishop Wilberforce	333
Bachelet, Bellarmin et la Bible Sixto-Clémentine	91
Baldwin, Thought and Things	223
Ball, Correspondence of Swift	515
Ballard, Determinism	29
,, Why does not God intervene?	420
Balsillie, Bergson's Philosophy	360
Barbour, Christian Ethics	172
Barth, N.T. in der Valentin. Gnosis	279
Batiffol, Credibility of the Gospel	272
Batten, Social Task of Christianity	81
Baudissin, Adonis and Esmun	90
Beddoe, Anthropological History of Europe	557
Begbie, Other Sheep	228
,, Ordinary Man	420
Benson, Leaves of the Tree	148
,, Child of the Dawn	423
Biblical and Theol. Studies	434
Black, Happiness	113
,, and Chrystal, W. Robertson Smith	437
Blewett, Christian View of the World	555
Böhl, Kanaanäer u. Hebräer	91
Borrow, Letters	186
Bosanquet, Individuality and Value	417
Boutroux, Beyond that is Within	556
,, Historic Studies in Philosophy	560
Box, Ezra-Apocalypse	469
Braithwaite, Beginnings of Quakerism	292
Brooke and McLean, O.T. in Greek	225
Buckley, Synoptic Problem	316
Burkitt, Syriac Forms of N.T. Proper Names	472
Burn, Athanasian Creed	321
Burrage, Early English Dissenters	314
Bury, Eastern Roman Empire	410
Cambridge History of English Literature	25, 371
Cambridge Medieval History	170
,, Modern History	224
Carpenter, Some Pages of my Life	188
Carroll, In Patria	175
Cecil, Conservatism	483
Charles, Book of Enoch	555
Cheshire, Church in Confederate States	374
Clarke, Ideal of Jesus	73
Coffey, Science of Logic	467
Coombe, Islands of Enchantment	319
Courtney, National Bibliography	372
Crane, William Morris to Whistler	121
Craufurd, Religion of Tolstoy	274
Crispi, Memoirs	514
Cumont, Astrology and Rel. among the Greeks and Romans	475
Cumont, Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism	81
Curtis, History of Creeds	148
Cuthbertson, A Tragedy of the Reformation	474
Czapek, Chemical Phenomena in Life	76
Davidson, Victor Hugo	468
Deimel, Veteris Testamenti Chronologia	504
Denney, Way Everlasting	153
Deussen, System of the Vedânta	559
Dewick, Primitive Christian Eschatology	371
Dictionary of Chr. Biography	26
Dowden, Bishops of Scotland	369
Du Bose, Reason of Life	100
Duchesne, History of Christian Church	558
Ellis, Family Letters of Wagner	78
Elmslie, Mishna on Idolatry	76
Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics	241
Eucken, Truth of Religion	233
,, Life's Basis and Life's Ideal	269
Expositor's Dictionary of Texts	131
Farnell, Greece and Babylon	248, 359
,, Higher Aspects of Greek Religion	361
Feine, Theologie des N.T.	502
Fletcher, Sermon on the Mount	145
Flournoy, Spiritism and Psychology	113
Forsyth, Christ on Parnassus	74
,, Faith, Freedom and the Future	411
Fortescue, The Mass	455
Fox, Journal	335
Frankenberg, Verständnis der Oden Salomos	181
Franklin, Palestine	227
Frazer, Dying God	110
,, Spirits of the Corn	552
Furneaux, Acts of the Apostles	317
Gardner, Rel. Experience of St. Paul	146
Garvie, Paul and his Gospel	175
Gemoll, Indogermanen im Alten Orient	91
Gibson, Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv	27
Glover, Christian Society	531
Gosling, Sir Humphrey Gilbert	188
Goudge, Mind of St. Paul	116
Grane, Passing of War	360
Gray, Isaiah	372
Gupta, Romish Chunder Dutt	226
Haile and Bonney, John Lingard	271
Hall, Evolution and the Fall	455
Handbuch zum N.T.	564
Handcock, Mesopotamian Archæology	518
Haney, History of Economic Thought	79
Harrison, Biographic Memoirs	187
,, Themis	529
Hart, Chronos	470
Harvey-Jellie, Wisdom of God	115
Herford, Pharisaism	521
Hermann, Eucken and Bergson	418
Herrick, Christian and Mohammedan	422
Hillis, Contagion of Character	80
,, Battle of Principles	457
Hilton-Simpson, Land and Peoples of the Kasai	174
Hogarth, Hittite Problems	472
Hogg, Christ's Message of the Kingdom	226, 394, 566
Holmes, London's Underworld	471
Hoskier, Versions of N.T.	117
,, Date of Bohairic Version	232
Hume, India's Religious History.	82
Hume Brown, Hist. of Scotland	221
Hutton, Disciple's Religion	153
,, Eskimos of Labrador	358
Hyde, Five Great Philosophies of Life	319
Innis, England's Industrial Development	412
Isaacs, What is Judaism?	475
Islam and Missions	121
Islam, Teachings of	229
Jackson, Message and the Man	557
,, Preacher and the Modern Mind	531, 557
,, (ed.) Parting of the Roads	387
James, Memories and Studies	229
,, Radical Empiricism	517
Jastrow, Rel. Belief and Practice in Bab. and Assyria	244
Jerdan, Manna for Young Pilgrims	154
Jones, Hope of the Gospel	154

	PAGE
Jordan, Gesch. der altchrist. Literatur	90
Jörgansen, St. Francis of Assisi	368
Joyce, South American Archæology	473
Keith, Ancient Types of Man	228
Kelman, The Road	232
Kilpatrick, N.T. Evangelism	52
King, Sermons and Addresses	229
König, Heb. und aram. Wörterbuch	278
,, Gesch. der Alttest. Religion	278
Ladd, Teacher's Practical Philosophy	270
Lake, Earlier Epp. of St. Paul	97, 99
Lang, Short Hist. of Scotland	224
Lawson, Private Life of Warren Hastings	75
Lewis, Philocalia of Origen	75, 513
,, Forty Martyrs of the Sinai Desert	470
Lindsay, New Essays	316
,, Literary Essays	359
Livingstone, Greek Genius	481
Lloyd, Bushman Folklore	74
,, Creed of Half Japan	179
London Theological Studies	314
Lounsbury, Early Literary Career of Robert Browning	322
Lyttelton, Character and Religion	423
Macalister, Excavation of Gezer	550
Macculloch, Rel. of Ancient Celts	108, 220
Macdonald, Picturesque Paraguay	222
McEwen, Greek Christian Literature	322
M'Fadyen, Epp. to the Corinthians	229
McGiffert, Martin Luther	188
McKilliam, Chronicle of the Popes	515
M'Laren, Dr. M'Laren of Manchester	186
Macleane, Famous Sermons by Eng. Preachers	154
Macmillan, History of the Scottish People	176
McNeile, Deuteronomy	517
Macpherson, Intellectual Development of Scotland	271
Maeterlinck, Death	177
Margoliouth, Poetics of Aristotle	142
Marucchi, Christian Epigraphy	370
Masson, Memories of Two Cities	141
Mayor, Twelve Cambridge Sermons	225
Meakin, Hannah More	141
Moffatt, Reasons and Reasons	153
Montefiore, Liberal Judaism	293
Moore, Ethics and Education	411
Moulton, Religious Poetry of Persia	75
Murray, Christian Faith and the New Psychology	112
Myers, Experimental Psychology	113
Nicoll, Professor Elmslie	141
Nietzsche, Complete Works	111
Nunn, N.T. Greek	370
Oesterley and Box, Rel. and Worship of the Synagogue	30
Ogle, Canon Law in Mediæval England	412
Oman, Church and the Divine Order	77
Origen, Philocalia	75, 513
Ottley, Rule of Faith and Hope	377
Peake, Christianity	175
,, Jeremiah and Lamentations	317
Penny, Studies in Jacob Böhme	424
Peters, The Master	376
Pierce, Marprelate Tracts	118
Plummer, Churches in Britain before A.D. 1000	118, 376
Pollen, John Hungerford Pollen	554
Powicke, David Worthington Simon	416
Prayer Book Dictionary	551
Pullan, The Gospels	517
Putnam, William the Silent	141
Rendall, Charterhouse Sermons	3
Roberts, Renascence of Faith	454
Robertson and Plummer, 1 Corinthians	24
Robertson Smith, Lectures and Essays	470
Rodway, In the Guiana Forest	83
Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels to the O.T.	547
Rolleston, Myths and Legends of the Celtic Race	108
Roscoe, The Baganda	109
Rose, William Pitt	138
,, Pitt and Napoleon	410
Royce, William James	194
Russell, Afterthoughts	335
,, Edward King	370
Sachau, Aram. Papyrus u. Ostraka	92
Saintsbury, English Criticism	224
,, Loci Critici	227
Schaff-Herzog	28, 120, 417
Schumacher, Selbstoffenbarung Jesu	505
Schuré, Great Initiates	520
Schweitzer, Gesch. der Paulinischen Forschung	209
Scottish Liturgy	477, 478
Scripture Teaching in Secondary Schools	485
Scudder, Socialism and Character	419
Selby, God-lit City	229
Sellar, Bede's Eccles. History	411
Selwyn, Oracles in the N.T.	246
Seth, English Philosophers	359
Simpson, Spirit and the Bride	101
Skrine, Miracle and History	392
,, Creed and the Creeds	119
Smith, Ancient Egyptians	76
,, The Creeds	119
Spargo and Arner, Socialism	473
Spencer and Gillen, Across Australia	552
Stein, Desert Cathay	357
Steven, Psychology of the Christian Soul	112
Stirling, James Hutchison Stirling	333
Stone and Simpson, Communion with God	119
Story, Early Reminiscences	186
Taussig, Principles of Economics	313
Taylor, Hudson Taylor in Early Years	335
Tennyson, Tennyson and his Friends	229
Thomas, Mysteries of Grace	153
Thomson, Six Gates	211
Thumb, Modern Greek Vernacular	372
la Touche, Person of Christ in Modern Thought	455
Vedder, Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus	360
Voigt, Geschichte Jesu und die Astrologie	91
Voluntas Dei	421
Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible	553
Walpole, Life's Chance	233
Ward, Realm of Ends	111
Warschauer, What is the Bible?	114
Washington, My Larger Education	335
Watkinson, Life's Unexpected Issues	471
Watson, Story of Jerusalem	411
Webb, Relations of God and Man	231
Webster, Rest Days	477
Weeks, Congo Life and Folklore	109
Welch, Religion of Israel under the Kingdom	467
Wells, Choice of the Jews	29
Wendland, Miracles and Christianity	116
Wesley, Journal	334
White, Nov. Test. Latine: ed. minor	270
Whyte, James Fraser	141
Williamson, The Mafulu	416
Woods, At the Temple Church	153
Wright, Ice Age in N. America	27
Yerkes, Introd. to Psychology	112

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE
אִמְּהָ	169
אשימא	93, 136
מִרְאֶה	262
עדר	283
צִדְקָה, צֶדֶק	430

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
ἀγαθός	281
ἄγγελοι	182
ἀνάμνησις	379
εἰς	379
ἔλεγχος	182
ἐλεημοσύνη	430
ἐξουσία	39, 183
ἐπουράνιος	365
εὐποιία, εὐποιῶ	332, 379
καλός	281
καταργεῖσθαι	561
κοσμοκρατόρες	561
μογιλάλος	381
μυεῖσθαι	147
ὁμοούσιος	505
πράγματα	182
πρόσωπον	507
στέγω	260
στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου	562
συγχαίρω	260
τέλειος	147
ὑπόστασις	182, 507
φύσις	506
φωτίζω	147
χοϊνιξ	106

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gn ii. 7	169
vi. i. 2	167
vi. 3, 4	168, 237
vi. 5, 6, 7	169
vi. 8	170
vi. 9, 10, 11	275
vi. 12, 13, 14, 15	276
vi. 16, 17, 18	277
vi. 17–22	278
xxxi. 49	383
xli. 24	381
l. 26	237
Ex xx. 7	380
xxvii. 19	88
Nu xii. 8	260, 262
Dt xi. 10	94, 183, 237, 331
xxxii. 35	130
1 S viii. 11–18	130
2 S viii. 2	40
xiii. 5–8	39
xxiii. 15–17	52
1 K iv. 31	95
v. 6	263
xviii. 21	459
2 K viii. 7–15	68, 237, 282
xvii. 30	93, 136
2 Ch xxv. 2	492
xxxi. 21	492
Job xvii. 14	211, 330, 430
Ps xxxi. 20	184, 281, 332
lxxxvii. 1, 6	478
cxviii. 24	14
cxix. 105	63
cxix. 164	217
cxxvi. 6	124
cxxxix. 7	161
Pr i. 32	461
Ec ix. 4	154
Is xxvi. 3, 4	459
xxviii. 16	203
xxx. 15	300
Is xxxiii. 21, 22	129
xl. 6–8	349
liii. 2	400
Dn v.	181
ix. 27	184
Hos i. 2	524
xi. 9	521
Amos viii. 14	93, 136
Mt v. 20	430
v. 38–41	566
v. 48	5
vi. 24	459
vii. 2	130
viii. 2	246
x. 28	129
xi. 16–19	237
xiii. 31 f.	428
xv. 21–28	329, 430
xviii. 10	182
xix. 3–9	83
xx. 1–16	136
xxi. 13	461
xxv. 14–30	136, 382
xxv. 18	94
xxv. 31 ff.	87
xxviii. 19, 20	55
Mk iv. 10–12	531
iv. 31 f.	428
v. 37	93
vii. 24–30	329
vii. 31–37	381
x. 2–9	83
x. 29, 30	129
xiii. 26 f.	87
xiv. 7	332
xvi. 15	55
Lk ii. 1	478
iii. 7	185
iii. 23	246
iv. 9	184
iv. 20	193
Lk xiii. 19	428
xviii. 11, 14	461
xix. 12–27	136, 382
xxiv. 47	55
Jn i. 1–18	103
i. 13	526
i. 14	137
vii. 38, 39	180, 235, 331
x. 10	289
xi. 1–45	461
xiv. 35	460
xv. 14, 15	70
xvi. 2, 3	460
xix. 22	457
xxi. 18 ff.	200
Ac i. 8	55
i. 18	331, 478
v. 32	95
vii. 26	528
xii. 2	93
Ro i. 3, 4	444
i. 15	509
ii. 24	459
vi. 4, 5, 6	266
xii. 2	490
xiii. 1	460
xv. 4	253
xvi. 1	281
1 Co ii. 6–8	561
iv. 5	541
v. 5	490
viii. 1, 2	259
xi. 10	39, 183
xi. 23–26	378
xi. 32	490
xii. 31	259
xiii.	259
xiii. 2, 3	259
xiii. 7	260
xiii. 12	260, 261
xvi. 13	130
2 Co i. 1	181
ii. 6	490
iv. 4	491
vi. 15	459
xii. 9	39
Gal i. 4	490
ii. 19	492
ii. 20	266
iii. 28	391
iv. 3, 9	562
iv. 8, 9	459
iv. 31–v. 1	330
v. 15	460
Eph i. 3	366
i. 6	138, 331
i. 19, 20	309
i. 20	366
ii. 1	309
ii. 2	491
ii. 6	366
iii. 10	366, 492
iii. 16	150
vi. 12	366, 560
Col i. 13	490
ii. 8–20	562
ii. 12	267
ii. 15	561
2 Thess ii. 7	40
ii. 13	99
2 Ti ii. 3, 4	130
He ii. 2	492
xi. 1	182
xi. 35	129
Ja iii. 5	40
2 P ii. 12, 17	460
Jude 12, 13	460
Rev ii. 10	129
iv.–viii. 1	104
iv. 10	130
xix. 12	130
Ecclus vii. 25	234

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A few months ago the Rev. J. M. Thompson, Fellow and Dean of Divinity, Magdalen College, Oxford, published a book on the *Miracles in the New Testament*. He had already published two volumes of New Testament study, from either of which it might have been gathered that the miracles were incredible to him. But this was a small book. It could be easily bought and easily read. After a short but sharp discussion, chiefly in the correspondence columns of the newspapers, Mr. Thompson was suspended by the Bishop of Winchester from exercising his office as a teacher of theology in Magdalen College.

Then the editor of the *Guardian* invited three scholars to criticise Mr. Thompson's book, and he invited Mr. Thompson to answer them. First came Dr. Walter Lock, Warden of Keble College, with a single article in the *Guardian* for the 21st of July. After him Dr. Henry Scott Holland, Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, with three articles. Next the Rev. H. H. Williams, Fellow and Tutor of Hertford College, Oxford, with two articles. And in the issue for the 1st of September Mr. Thompson makes his reply.

Has Mr. Thompson read the articles in the *Guardian*? He does not say that he has not read them. But he ignores them. He goes back to the book without one word about the articles, and 'I should like,' he says, 'to recall our controversialists to the simple question, "Is what I have said true?"'

Now it may be doubted if Mr. Thompson had the right to accept the editor's invitation and then ignore his contributors. They are men of as much learning as himself. They have given as much of their lives to the study of the Gospels. But, apart from that, Mr. Thompson ought to know that the question 'Is it true?' is often quite unanswerable. He repeats his previous questions. For the most part they are long and complicated. Even if the subject were an easy one, such questions could not be answered with a simple 'Yes' or 'No.' But in so great and so difficult a subject as the supernatural in the Gospels, such a demand is utterly unreasonable. The truth is that in the study of the New Testament we ought by this time to have got beyond the pistol-shot question, 'Is it true?'

'Is it, or is it not, true "that St. Paul believed himself to possess special powers of the Holy Spirit, but that the language in which he himself describes these powers, does not cover anything more than faith-healing, and exorcism, which are instances of natural law, not miracles"?' That is Mr. Thompson's first question. Is it possible

to answer it with a monosyllable? If Mr. THOMPSON demands a monosyllabic answer, the probability is that nine out of ten of the students of the New Testament in this country—we mean men who have studied the New Testament as thoroughly as he has done—will answer 'No.' And if they do, where is he then? His whole article proceeds on the assumption that every one of his interrogatives 'Is it true?' must receive the answer 'Yes.'

'Is it true'—this is his second question—'that those miracle stories in St. Mark which fall outside the sphere of faith-healing can be adequately explained by "the tendency to transform natural events into supernatural, the love of assimilation, the ease with which an editor can give a new turn to a passage, and the influence of present interests upon the representation of the past"?' Did any man ever spread a net in the sight of a bird before? Mr. THOMPSON has cleverly condensed the whole modern argument against the Gospel miracles into one sentence, and demanded, Yes or No? The argument has been forged from the history of religion. But it is impossible to imagine any one who has studied the history of religion answering 'Yes.' We know what the myth-making faculty has done here and there. We certainly do not know that it has ever done all that Mr. THOMPSON assigns to it. Only once, indeed, has it had the chance. That is in the Gospels themselves. For only in the Gospels are miracles such as these to be found. We may think that the Bishop of Winchester was precipitate, but we must admit that any teacher who put so complicated a question deserved to be suspended, for incapacity.

But it is after we have passed Mr. THOMPSON'S interrogatives that we come to understand him. His article is divided into two parts. The second part opens with the familiar statement, that the miracles in the Gospels do not differ from other miracles. 'The miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury,' says Mr. THOMPSON, 'are in many cases of the same kind as those recorded in the Gospels; they often show the same character of benevolence, the same capacity for illustrating or enshrining spiritual faith; the same naturalness and simplicity; they tend, as the Gospel miracles do, to become more and more miraculous; they could be divided in the same way, and with about as much success, as the Gospel miracles have been divided, into a canonical and an apocryphal series; the better attested of them rest on stronger evidence than any miracles in the New Testament.'

Mr. THOMPSON declares that the miracles of St. Thomas show 'the same capacity for illustrating or enshrining spiritual faith.' If by 'spiritual faith' he means 'spiritual truth,' what a revelation this is of his entrance into the mind of Christ. But if he uses the word 'faith' purposely, in order to suggest that the miracles of Christ are like the miracles of St. Thomas in that they also need faith and the same faith to apprehend their value, then what a revelation it is of his conception of faith.

He dares to say that the miracles of St. Thomas often show 'the same naturalness and simplicity' as the miracles in the Gospels. And then he says that 'they tend, as the miracles in the Gospels do, to become more and more miraculous.' The miracles in the Gospels do *not* tend to become more and more miraculous. There are miracles in St. Mark that are as miraculous as any miracle in St. John. Finally, he says that the better attested miracles of St. Thomas 'rest on stronger evidence than any miracles in the New Testament.' From which it is very clear that Mr. THOMPSON does not know what evidence is.

And this is the explanation of his attitude throughout. He takes the miracles of the Gospels in groups, brings forward what he calls evidence for or against them, and so disposes of them in the lump. And when he has disposed of them, as natural events transformed into supernatural, or as due to the love of assimilation, or to the skill with which an editor 'can give a new

turn to a passage,' he is convinced that he has explained, and explained away, the supernatural in the Gospels.

There is no doubt that the denial of the supernatural in the Gospels is now very common. The most plausible argument against it is found in the history of religion. And Mr. THOMPSON is right when he claims that that argument has not yet received the attention it deserves from the Christian Church. Men who make some claim to scholarship, and who, at any rate in the pulpit, handle the question of miracles occasionally, are in almost total darkness about the history of religion. But that is no excuse for Mr. THOMPSON. For every one of the writers in the *Guardian* has shown himself well acquainted with the argument that the miracles in the Gospels are the slow product of the myth-making faculty. Dr. LOCK even admits that there is a progress in the New Testament from a more human conception of Christ to a more divine. But he claims that that progress is not in myth-making, but simply in interpretation.

'The life described in the Gospels,' he says, 'is admittedly many-sided, and moves on a level far above that of ordinary men. The teaching, the actions, were often misinterpreted in His lifetime; the Teacher was constantly spiritualizing Jewish language, Apocalyptic and other, that He found ready to His hand; His followers were constantly materializing His teaching. The conception of what the Teacher was, grew very gradually in the minds of those who were most intimate with Him. When it had grown, it was shattered by the crucifixion, and gradually it had to be rebuilt and reinterpreted in the light of the Resurrection.'

Dr. LOCK asks: 'Is not such a life exactly the life which most needs some distance in order to see it in true proportion?' He admits, of course, that the Gospels, all the Gospels, are later than most of St. Paul's Epistles; that they come from a Church, and are accepted by a Church, which was accustomed to St. Paul's high Christology and teaching about the Spirit. And yet, on the whole, he says, they reproduce in a striking degree the thought of the earlier days; they show the gradual deepening of insight into the meaning of the life. And Dr. LOCK concludes with the strong but defensible statement: 'It is therefore as likely as not that the writer of the Fourth Gospel is far nearer to the true interpretation of what Jesus said and did and was than the compiler of Q, that document which is supposed to be the oldest source for the life of Christ.'

There are several promising volumes of sermons in the autumn lists, including three in the 'Scholar as Preacher' series. But it will take a very fine volume to surpass in interest one that is already published by Dr. RENDALL, late Head Master of Charterhouse. And yet the sermons it contains were every one of them preached to boys. The title is simply *Charterhouse Sermons* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net).

Take the sermon on Forgiveness. Most of us make mistakes about forgiveness. But Dr. RENDALL is concerned with the mistakes which boys make. The first mistake which boys make is that when a sin is forgiven its consequences are cancelled. Are they cancelled? Dr. RENDALL declares that life, experience, history, all proclaim the opposite. As Marcus DODS, in his *Early Letters*, familiarly puts it, 'What's did *is* did and can't be didder.' That which is done is done, and cannot even by forgiveness be undone.

And that which is left undone cannot be done. Most appropriately, in speaking to boys, the Head Master of Charterhouse selects the sin of idleness. 'There is no magic,' he says, 'by which in after years you can hope to make good, wasted terms that will never come again.' 'Their record,' he says, 'will be a blank on the day you stand before the judgment-seat, and the books are opened. It is true that the hymn says comfortably, "Time

that's lost may all redeem." But the hymn does not say so truly. Idleness may by God's grace be done away; by repentance, by strain of godly sorrow and forgiveness it may be changed, *re-born* into resolute and energetic desire for service. But the fruits of idleness remain. Their effect in others' lives, and in your own, has passed out of your power to change or better.'

The mischief caused by the notion that consequences can be cancelled is manifold. For one thing, it fosters the idea that the punishment of sin is arbitrary and imposed from without. Do we not even deliberately teach our children that if they commit sin, God will punish them for it? We ought to teach them that they punish themselves. Did not each sin of which even Sir Percival had been guilty rise up against him as he drew near the Holy Grail?

Then every evil word I had spoken once,
And every evil thought I had thought of old,
And every evil deed I ever did,
Awoke and cried, 'This Quest is not for thee.'

And sin begets sin. Separate sins become habits of sin. And then the conflict is lamentably unequal.

And as oft
As Gareth brought him grovelling on his knees,
So many a time he vaulted up again;
Till Gareth panted hard, and his great heart,
Foredooming all his trouble was in vain,
Labour'd within him, for he seem'd as one
That all in later, sadder age begins
To war against ill uses of a life,
But these from all his life arise, and cry,
'Thou hast made us lords, and canst not put us down.'

Nevertheless there is forgiveness. And the miracle of it is that it makes the sin, not as if it never had been, but better than if it never had been. Dr. RENDALL, speaking to Public School boys, is not afraid to say it makes it better. By God's grace, he says, the forgiven soul, like the oyster, may 'mend its shell with a pearl.' Where the wound and blemish was, there comes, he says, with the healing, not a scar, but a pearl. We leave the miserable consequence in the hand of a God of healing, and in thankfulness acknowledge that for us the besetting sin is changed, as it were, into a guardian angel. So forgiveness transfigures life.

This is the modern mystery. It is for this that the modern Milton has to rise and say:

What in me is dark
Illumine, what is low raise and support;
That to the height of this great argument
I may assert Eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men.

We dare not sin against God. God forbid that we should ever dream that we may sin against God and not be the worse for it. And yet have we not come to the conclusion, that forgiveness is more than the old military word of command—'As you were'? Have we not come to believe that to whom much is forgiven the same loveth much?

The other mistake that boys make is to think that forgiveness means forgetting. 'Forgive and forget,' the careless proverb says, 'and I read only the other day the eulogy of one who, it was said, knew not only how to forgive, but what is far better, to forget.' That thought makes two mistakes. It misses the virtue of forgiveness, and it misunderstands the work of the love of God.

God does not forget. The All-wise, the All-knowing, the All-caring, He by whom 'the very hairs of your head are all numbered,' He who 'understandeth our thoughts long before,' and 'who putteth our tears into his bottle,' is it possible that He should put away omniscience and forget? Is it desirable that He should forget? When we are sorry for a sin, when we turn from it with shame and detestation, is not our first instinct to

make a clean breast of it, to be rid of the hateful secret? Is it not our strongest desire that He against whom we have sinned should know it to the uttermost? Dr. RENDALL recalls the parable of the Prodigal Son: 'I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him'—hiding nothing from him.

And as we wish the sin to be known, we wish it to be remembered. For the forgiveness of the sin becomes a sacred tie of friendship, affection, and trust. To wish it forgotten is to wish to make it less than it is, and so to make the forgiveness less. It is to repent that it was confessed in all its fulness. It is a treachery to love.

It is a treachery to human love. If I forgive a sin I do not need to forget it. The love that enabled me to forgive is large enough to cover the remembrance of its forgiveness. And if the sin is not forgotten, then it is a holy pledge between me and thee that as long as the remembrance lasts the repetition of that sin has become morally impossible.

And it is a treachery to the love of God. 'My sins are ever before me,' said the Psalmist. For he knew that they were ever before God, and that the remembrance of them gave him the assurance of the inexhaustible love of God, and kept him from continuing in sin.

'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect' (Mt 5^{48}). In these days of 'No theology, please,' is there any one left who is interested in perfection? There are still some who are interested in it. They are interested in it practically, as a matter of life and conduct; which means, no doubt, that they are much less violently interested in it than if it were a matter of theology and theory. But those who believe that they are already perfect, and those who believe that they never can be—those two classes are interested in perfection still.

Was it to those who are already perfect that our Lord said, 'Ye shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect'? That is clearly impossible. Not because we must take the verb in the future tense. We need not take the verb in the future tense; and we had better not. For if we are ever to be perfect, let us be perfect now. He did not say, 'Ye shall be perfect,' or 'Be ye perfect,' to those who believed they were perfect already, simply because to them He never had anything to say at all. 'They that are whole,' He said, 'have no need of a physician'; 'I came to call sinners.'

To those who believed that they were perfect already, He had nothing to say. It was only incidentally, and turning for the moment, as it were, from His proper work, that He addressed Himself to them at all. And then only to let them understand that they were very far indeed from being perfect. Nicodemus came to him by night. Nicodemus was perfect already. By the very principles of the life he lived, he and all the Pharisees with him were perfect. If they offended in one thing, they offended in all. They knew that. And therefore they persuaded themselves, as they were bound to do, that they had not come short of the demands of the Law through all their life in respect to one jot or one tittle of it. 'Master,' said one of them, 'all these things have I kept from my youth up.' Of course he had; they had all kept all these things.

What did Jesus say to Nicodemus? He did not say that he was not perfect, but He said that he must be born again. He said that if he was perfect on his own lines his perfection was worth nothing. It was worth less than nothing; it was a hindrance to true perfection. He said that Nicodemus must take down all that building which he had built so laboriously and so admirably, and begin at the beginning again. To use His own most graphic and inimitable figure, He said he must start his life over again as from infancy, as a new-born child, in a new attitude

and with a new aim. He said he must be born again.

A rich young ruler came to Him. To the ruler He said, 'Sell that thou hast, and come, follow me.' It is the word to Nicodemus over again. Begin at the very beginning. Sell everything; leave nothing, absolutely nothing, unsold. Give the whole of it to the poor, and then begin a new life in a new attitude, in a new relationship which you will find in Me. Sell and come. These are His two demands always upon the already perfect. Sell, that is, get rid of the whole of the bad method of living; and come, that is, begin a new life with a new motive, a life which not only leads to but actually is perfection.

Nor did Jesus say, 'Be ye perfect,' to those who hold that nobody can ever be perfect on earth. That is as undeniably clear as the other. For it is the earth, you may say, that He speaks about always. In comparison with His interest in the earth, He is just as little interested in heaven as we are. 'Be ye perfect' is the sum of the Sermon on the Mount, and the Sermon on the Mount is meant for this world.

Nor is it a 'Counsel of Perfection' merely. Our Lord never in all His teaching uttered one single 'Counsel of Perfection'—one single precept that could not be translated into life and conduct. This in connexion with the Sermon on the Mount is our grand mistake. It is our fatal mistake. 'I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also'—if that is not meant to be done, there is mockery in the statement of it. Those who deny that it is meant to be done, are living in entire misapprehension of what the Sermon on the Mount is meant for. Certainly it is just as difficult to turn the other cheek as to be perfect; but both precepts are possible here and now, or Jesus had not uttered them.

Now the first thing to notice is that there is at least one person who is perfect already. 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, *as your heavenly Father is perfect.*' Do you say, Of course God is perfect? Well, of course He is; but that is not what our Lord says. He says *our heavenly Father* is perfect. God is perfect as Father, that is what He says. And when is a father perfect? He is perfect when he loves. He is perfect when he loves his children with a perfect love. And love in our heavenly Father is no more an abstract, distant thing than is love in an earthly father. Our Father knows what we have need of. 'If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him.'

God is perfect as a Father. It is the only perfection in God that we are interested in. It is the only thing that we need to know about in God. And just as it is the perfection of a father that Christ attributes to God, so is it the perfection of a son and no other perfection that He demands from us.

For, first, it is the perfection of a man. It is the perfection of a man with a will, a will to obey or to disobey. Otherwise He would not demand it; He would simply impose it. He does not say to the lilies of the field, 'Be ye perfect'; He simply makes them perfect. And that is just another way of saying that it is not the perfection of the Pharisee. The perfection of the Pharisee is the perfection of a circle. Take your compasses and draw it. Let the two ends meet accurately. Your circle is complete and perfect, but it is not the perfection of a son.

It is not only the perfection of a man. It is the perfection of a man who has been imperfect, who is imperfect still. He has been imperfect. He has not, like the Pharisee, remained at home doing his day's work faultlessly. He has not gone out every morning at the same accurate hour and returned every evening with the same sense of satisfaction, so much work done, so much wages earned. He has been away in the far country.

He has spent his substance in riotous living. But he has come home again. And when he came home, the father said, 'This my son'; 'bring forth the best robe.'

He is imperfect still. Here is the paradox of perfection. We shall be perfect whilst we are still imperfect. That is what our Lord means. He means that we shall be perfect as sons, perfect in having entered into the real relationship of sons, in having the heart of sons, in loving as only sons can love. 'I am bold to say'—this is the Pharisee:

> I am bold to say,
> I can do with my pencil what I know,
> What I see, what at bottom of my heart
> I wish for, if I ever wish so deep—
> Do easily, too—when I say, perfectly,
> I do not boast, perhaps.

'Father, thou knowest that I love thee.' This is the perfection of the son.

The Present Theological Situation.

By the Rev. J. M. Shaw, M.A., Logiepert.

I.

The outstanding feature of the theological activity of the last twenty years has been the thoroughgoing application in the sphere of religion of a method or principle of study which was first applied with good result in other branches of human inquiry. The guiding idea of the nineteenth century—the idea of evolution or development—bade us see everywhere not sudden inbreaks of creative power, but continuous progressive change from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, by means of an immanent power working according to certain observable laws. Fruitful in the world of nature, this scientific conception became increasingly applied to the study of history, converting an atomistic into an organic view of things; until in the latter half of the nineteenth century the method—generally spoken of, in its particular relation to the study of history, as 'the historical method'—employed in the sphere of religion gave rise to a new reading of religious history.

The first application of the new evolutionary conception was within Christianity itself. Its general result was to emphasize the fact that the revelation of God to Israel culminating in Jesus Christ was a gradual progressive revelation, suited or accommodated to the developing religious capacities of the race and individuals. When this was realized, many formerly felt difficulties found a natural explanation. The imperfect morality of the Old Testament, for example, and the correspondingly imperfect forms of worship which it brings before us, ceased to appear unworthy of a place in the record of a Divine revelation. Doctrines and practices which were morally impossible as the last word of revelation became intelligible when seen in their place as steps or stages in the process.

But this idea, once adopted, could not fail sooner or later to demand a wider and more thoroughgoing application. An evolution or development there is within Christianity. That is granted. May not Christianity itself also come within evolution? Two things combined to delay until recent years the coming forward of this further question. *First*, there was the belief in the special revelational character of the Christian religion, according to which it was viewed as a religious phenomenon of an exceptional miraculous character extra- or supra-natural in its rise and progress, infallible in its sacred books, over against all manner of false religions—'a holy island in the sea of history.' In the very nature of the case, such a belief discouraged any attempt to relate, for purposes of elucidation or explanation, the religion of the Old and New Testaments to extra-Christian religious history. *Second*, even where such a belief was no longer actively operative, our knowledge of non-Christian religions was so meagre that the indispensable fact-basis for the application of such a method of study was not yet provided. The

recent widening, however, of the horizon of our knowledge of civilizations and religions outside the Christian, through the investigations of scientific workers in many fields, especially in archæology, ethnology, and comparative mythology, as well as the close practical contact with other peoples and their history through geographical exploration, international commerce, and missionary enterprise, —all this has emphasized the resemblances and affinities between religions everywhere, and in particular has encouraged the endeavour to interpret or explain the religion of the Old and New Testaments as far as possible by connexion with or dependence on other religions.

Historically, it is said,—such is the contention of the present—Christianity is but one religion among others, one of the many forms which the religious consciousness has assumed in the long course of its development. It entered the world in certain historical circumstances, it appeared in a certain historical context. Let it be studied then 'scientifically,' that is to say, by the principles of historical criticism applied with success in other branches of inquiry. Let it be considered—the religion of Jesus Christ, including its Old Testament preparation—in its place in the stream of religious history, and in essential connexion with religions chronologically and geographically adjacent to it. Only so, it is held, will the nature of Christianity as an historical religion reveal itself: only so will the superiority of Christianity to other religions, if superiority there be, be rationally or scientifically established.

In the field of Old Testament research, this has meant a new interest of recent years in the study of the general religious environment of Israel. Of this new interest the most characteristic outcome has been the rise and progress of a school or movement called the 'Pan-Babylonian,' which seeks to show that the influence of Babylonia on the religion and culture of Israel was much greater than Old Testament pioneers, such as Ewald, Robertson Smith, and Wellhausen, had even suspected. This movement was first brought into prominence by the famous *Babel-Bibel* lectures of the Assyriologist, Friedrich Delitzsch, delivered in the winters of 1902 and 1903 before the Emperor in Berlin. The chief names associated with the movement are those of Winckler, Zimmern, Jeremias, Gunkel, and Jensen. The tendency throughout is to convert a great part of the Old Testament history, and not a little of the New Testament as well, into forms of Babylonian myth. The ethical monotheism of Israel, for example, is traced by Jeremias largely to extra-Israelitish influences. And the New Testament representation of the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus is represented by Zimmern as little more than a repetition of Marduk and Tammuz myths.

In relation to the New Testament, the new point of view has meant a deepening of interest in the question of Christian origins, and a thoroughgoing attempt to understand much even in the central writings of Christianity through the influence of the non-Christian environment, not only Judaistic but extra-Judaistic—Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, Greek, and Roman. The general point of view in this connexion may fairly well be represented by the thesis of Gunkel, one of the pioneers of the movement, that 'in its origin and shaping (*Ausbildung*), in important, even in some essential, points the religion of the New Testament stood under the influence of alien religions' (*Zum religionsgesch. Verständnis des N.T.*, p. 1).

Of the new interest, more particularly in the Judaistic background of the New Testament, the most significant token is the recent heightened appreciation of the apocalyptic element in our Lord's teaching. So largely, indeed, is attention devoted to this question that it may, without injustice, be described as constituting the storm-centre of New Testament criticism at the present time. The generally accepted view of criticism for many years had been that Jesus' teaching concerning the Kingdom of God had to do with the present rather than with the future, and was ethical rather than eschatological. But as the result of more recent study of the Jewish apocryphal literature, as embodied in such a work, for instance, as Bousset's *Jewish Religion in New Testament Times*, the tendency has been of late to emphasize the apocalyptic element in the Gospels, and to hold that for Jesus the Kingdom was, if not wholly, yet in the main or on the whole, future and catastrophic. It was Johannes Weiss who, in 1892, in his work on *The Preaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God*, started this new mode of interpretation. He maintained that Jesus' conception of the Kingdom was not partly present and partly future, but wholly future, eschatological, and transcendent. In the second edition of his book, in 1900, Weiss considerably modified his view. But his original

position has been adopted and developed by others who claim to find in eschatology the master-key to Jesus' teaching. Prominent among these is the name of the brilliant young Strassburg scholar, Albert Schweitzer, who in 1906 published his work *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, translated into English under the title of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*—a book which largely through Professor Sanday's characteristically generous estimate has met with much more appreciation in this country than in Germany. In Schweitzer's representation Jesus becomes practically the victim of eschatology, a *Zukunftsfanatiker*, and His whole ethical ideal and teaching is depreciated as merely an *Interimsethik*, conditioned by His belief in the near approach of the end. Just as in time of war, special laws are proclaimed for the special circumstances of the time, to be abrogated as soon as these circumstances pass away, so the moral precepts of Jesus, especially those of a negative and world-despising kind, are to be understood as applying only to a state of affairs which is *interim* and about to pass away.

Now this deepened interest in the question of Israelitish and Christian origins involves, it is evident, a great widening of the province of Biblical exegesis and theology. The old standpoint of Biblical exegesis, according to which for the Bible student there existed only the Old Testament and the New, is gone; and the sphere of investigation has been enlarged to include, not only extra-canonical Jewish religion and literature, but the whole religious literature of the time—Jewish and non-Jewish alike. No longer can it be held to be enough for the explanation of a Biblical idea to take all the scriptural passages where it occurs and, by combining them, arrive at its general meaning. Its antecedents must be inquired into. It must be investigated in the context of general religious history. Heitmüller, for example, seeks to explain the meaning and usage of the New Testament phrase 'in the name of Jesus' by bringing forward analogies in Babylonian, Persian, Mandean and other forms of religion and worship where the name of the Deity is thought of as itself a part of the Divine essence, the mere utterance of which acts as a kind of charm. And Gunkel, in like fashion, places the whole Christ-picture of the New Testament—not only the Christological presentation of Paul and John, but the Gospel narratives of the Infancy, Baptism, Temptation, Transfiguration, Resurrection, and Ascension—in the wide-flowing stream of religious history, and endeavours to explain, or at least interpret, the New Testament representation of Christ by the help of mythological conceptions diffused throughout the Orient, and derived chiefly from Babylonia.

No doubt this new genetic, or embryological, study of Biblical conceptions has been by many, in the enthusiasm of a new love, carried to unwarranted extremes. What is at best analogy has been too often hastily interpreted as evidence of dependence or borrowing, little justice being done to the properly Israelitish and Christian development itself. Under the influence of such methods, some have even undertaken to explain the New Testament representation of Christ without the assumption of the historical personality of Jesus. But such extravagances are not of the essence of the movement, and already the further progress of research is leading to a conservative reaction against such extreme positions. In Old Testament study, for example, the result of placing the religion and literature of Israel alongside the religion and literature of the ancient Oriental world has been to set in a clearer light than ever the distinctive features of the religion of Israel. If somewhat of its previously conceived originality has disappeared in the process—many features which were once thought to be exclusively Israelitish now being known to be common to surrounding peoples—never before has its uniqueness been so convincingly demonstrated. In particular, the outcome of the 'Pan Babylonian' movement has been to emphazise the fact that Babylonia had almost nothing to teach Israel ethically, and it was from ethical sources within herself, and not from outside influence, that the monotheism of Israel immediately arose.

So also, in New Testament research, with reference to the radical apocalyptic movement, it is being increasingly recognized that a purely eschatological interpretation of Jesus' teaching is unwarrantable. Jesus may have adopted the apocalyptic ideas of His time, but in the very act of adopting them He remoulded and transformed them. He gave them a new moral and religious significance, filling them with a new content which made His teaching independent of the passing thought of the age. Though the eschatological interpretation of the Gospels, no doubt, has a

relative justification in that it has tended to rectify the balance which formerly had dipped too far on the side of a purely ethical interpretation, yet to adopt a merely apocalyptic point of view is to unduly narrow the significance of Jesus' teaching.

Such extravagances in detail, then, as we have referred to, are being corrected by the progress of research itself, and are not to be looked upon as affecting the permanent gains of the new method. Of these gains we may mention three.

First, Biblical exegesis has become for the first time scientific and historical. Hitherto Biblical interpretation had been too much dominated by dogmatic and practical considerations. Men did not ask what the prophets said, nor what the apostles meant, but what God had to tell them by the mouth of His prophets and apostles. The result was that, as Von Dobschütz has pointed out, each generation treated them as men of their own time. In Neander and Godet, Paul is a pectoral theologian, in Baur he is a Hegelian, in Luthardt an orthodox, and in Ritschl a genuine Ritschlian. But now the Biblical writings are seen in their true perspective, against the background of their time, and the first question is—What was the meaning of the men who wrote them, and how were they understood by those to whom they were written? This characteristic of modern exegesis is sometimes called Romanticism, but it is better spoken of as a new feeling for historical sincerity, what the Germans call *Wirklichkeitssinn*.

Second, as the result of this historical orientation of the Biblical writings there has come about a revivifying or revitalizing of Bible study. The Bible, whatever else it is, has become for us in a new sense a genuinely human book, and as such subject in great measure to the same general conditions as mould other forms of human literature.

Third, the new study of religion has enlarged and deepened our conception of the ways of God with men. Just as the Darwinian theory of organic development when truly interpreted, instead of banishing God from the world as was at first thought, has led to a wider and a grander teleology: so the general historical study of religion, by showing us continuous progressive action of the Divine on the human rather than sudden special revelation, will, when realized, lead to a wider and worthier theodicy.

II.

Closely connected with this new interest in the history of religion, with its determinative influence on the conception of the place of Christianity in religious history, is a second, and in some respects more significant, feature of the present, namely, the application of psychology to the interpretation of religious experience. The comparative study of religions, with the auxiliary disciplines of genetic psychology, anthropology, and ethnology, by investigating the growth and development of the religious consciousness racially as well as individually, and emphasizing the essential unity of the religious nature of man everywhere—a unity manifesting itself in similar beliefs, ceremonials, and institutions where similar conditions are fulfilled, has provided the data for a psychological study of religion correlating and interpreting the facts with a view to the discovery of general laws of religious development.

The sphere in which the new science claims to be most serviceable is in the interpretation of the facts of conversion. The literature of the subject, apart from preliminary magazine articles, began with the publication in 1899 of Professor Starbuck's *Psychology of Religion*—a biological, psychological study of the fact of conversion in relation to the phenomena of adolescence. This was followed in 1900 by Professor Coe's *The Spiritual Life*, which, while written from the same point of view, contained a larger element of experimental data more particularly regarding the different types of religious experience. Best known, however, in this connexion is the name of the late Professor James, who, in his Edinburgh Gifford Lectures (1899–1901), *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, made the religious experiences of mankind the subject of most careful scientific investigation.

But more recently the new science has been applied to the interpretation of another department of religious experience—the facts of inspiration and prophecy. Last year there was published a book by the Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden (Dr. Joyce), entitled *The Inspiration of Prophecy*, in which psychology is applied to the explanation of prophetic inspiration, both Hebrew and Christian. Just as in the sphere of religious history, so long as Christianity was set over against all other religions as the one supernatural religion, there was no possibility of the rise of an historical science of

religion, so, as long as inspiration was looked upon as the monopoly of one faith—a break in religious experience as the Christian religion was conceived to be in religious history—there was no possibility of raising the question how far prophetic inspiration could be brought under a law applicable to it and analogous experiences outside the pale of revealed religion. But with the waning of the old mechanical theory of inspiration, and the increasing investigation, under the influence of evolutionary thought, of the religious consciousness in its various manifestations, Christian and extra-Christian, points of resemblance and affinity revealed themselves, and the question was raised whether the prophetic inspirational experience is something altogether apart and distinct, *sui generis*, or not rather the exhibition, though on a higher and more impressive scale, of the same activities as come into play in religious consciousness everywhere. In this book the author, by an investigation into the first beginnings of prophecy and an attempt to trace its connexion with earlier and cruder spiritual manifestations, seeks to show that the fact of prophetic inspiration in Israel was not an abrupt interposition in religious history and experience but rather an evolution out of lower spiritual operations such as those of the diviner and the soothsayer.

This is not to explain away prophecy as a mere natural psychological occurrence apart from Divine influence. The evolution of prophecy is not, any more than the evolution of nature, inconsistent with Divine action. There is nothing derogatory to the Divine in supposing that the means employed by the Spirit of God in the case of the prophet was to heighten and direct psychic powers that belonged in some measure naturally to men of a certain temperament. What it does mean is—and the outcome of it may, with sufficient precision for the present, be defined by saying—that a new mode of conceiving the method of Divine action has been introduced which makes the working of the mind of the prophet more intelligible, bringing it within the domain of law and orderly control. God is no longer conceived as standing apart from human nature, asserting His presence by occasional arbitrary interference with the laws of its working, but as revealing Himself through the psychical laws of man's constitution—over all, yet in all and through all working out His will. The supernatural of revealed religion is seen to be not the extra-natural but the higher natural, the natural raised to a higher power; and along this line, as we have seen along the line of historical revelation, a new conception of the ways of the Spirit of God with men is introduced.

The science is still in its infancy, and many of its general results may require revision and modification in the light of future inquiry. The significant thing about the new movement is that those at the head of it are not theologians, but scientists who have come to the study of religion from outlying provinces, for the most part from the medico-physiological side. Their interest, accordingly, is not primarily in religion, but in science. Little wonder, then, that up to the present the naturalistic atmosphere of medical and physiological studies has too much surrounded their work, and that ground has been given for the suspicion that the new interpretation of the facts of religious experience is an ally of that all-consuming movement of the day which is directed against the supernatural. The tendency always is, as in the case of the historical science of religion, to investigate the facts of primitive religious consciousness, with the avowed intention of finding therein the key to the understanding of the higher religious consciousness, and as a result to do injustice to the uniqueness of Christian experience. But whatever judgment may be passed upon some of the theories put forward in connexion with the new science, one must recognize how aptly many of the facts collected and systematized for its own purposes serve at least to illustrate the experiences of saint and prophet. Already it can be seen that just as the historical study of religion has revolutionized our thought of Biblical history, so the new study of the psychology of religion is likely to bring about no less a revolution in our conception of Biblical religious experience. So much so that not only for the theologian, but for the preacher—concerned as he is with the interpretation of religious experience to his own generation—the study of the psychology of religion is one of the most imperative duties of the present. Of this Dr. Sanday's recent hypothetical attempt in *Christologies, Ancient and Modern*, to interpret the relation between the Divine and the human in the consciousness of our Lord by means of the theory of the subliminal self is but the latest significant token.

III.

The effect of this scientific historico-psychological spirit of recent thought is that Systematic Theology for the present is somewhat in the background, elbowed out of front rank by the two dominant interests of comparative religion and religious psychology. This relative obscuring of Systematic, however, can be but temporary. Already voices are being raised calling for advance to a restatement of Christian doctrine on the broadened basis supplied by recent scientific research and in terms more suited to modern thought. 'Enough of history' (wir haben zu Viel von Geschichte), Weinel was heard exclaiming recently, as he lamented the dominance of the scientific historical interest at the expense of the more properly religious and ethical.

Though the time for such a restatement, however, may not yet have arrived, the whole trend of recent historical and psychological research has been in the direction of making ever clearer what the line of cleavage must be between the dogmatic theologies of the future. The alternative—as reflected in the 'Jesus-Paul' controversy in Germany, and the 'Jesus or Christ' controversy in this country—is to be between what Sanday has called a 'full' and a 'reduced' or 'attenuated' Christology and theology. No longer is it enough to talk of a Christocentric Christianity, and to call 'Back to Christ.' We have to define our Christ. Even with Christ in the centre, the issue is between an anthropocentric Christianity and a theocentric Christianity.

The tendency of the new scientific evolutionary movement in religion is towards the former. Its standpoint is well represented by Bousset in his recent work, *What is Religion?* where the whole history of the religious life of mankind is looked on as the great handiwork of God, 'a constant intercourse of God with man, of man with His maker, in accordance with the stage to which he has attained.' The supernatural is not denied. Rather the whole religious history of mankind becomes a natural supernatural process, the religion of the Old and New Testaments representing but the purest and highest form to which religion has yet attained. The tendency accordingly is to subsume Jesus under a general notion, to make Him one of a class, the greatest religious 'genius' or 'hero' of history, far above all other men, and in virtue of His life and message truly our Lord and Master, but yet one of a series.

The absoluteness of Jesus for the life of religion is thus challenged to-day from the side of historical evolutionism. The old dogmas must go—the Divinity of Christ, the Trinity, the conceptions of Atonement and Redemption. This 'dogmatic' Christianity is due to Paul. He innovated, it is said, when he made Christianity the religion of redemption or atonement. We must get back from Paul, back from the subtleties and dogmas of the Judaic and pagan theologoumena of the apostles, back to the simple and direct teaching of the Master. And just here, it is claimed, is the great achievement of the scientific scholarship of the past twenty years—the separation, namely, which it has made between the Divine 'Christ of faith' and the human 'Jesus of history.' For practically two thousand years—such is the representation—Paulinism has overlaid Christianity, and the Church has been building on a wrong foundation. For the first time recent scientific research has enabled us to return to the 'religion of Jesus' as distinct from 'the gospel of Christ.'

Now it may readily be agreed that in this new emphasis on the 'Jesus of history' there is much of the nature of real gain. Whatever else it has done, recent study of the historical Jesus has recalled theology to the genuine historical humanity of Jesus as the basis of any worthy dogmatic construction of His Person. In traditional orthodoxy scant justice often was done to this side of the nature of Christ. The human and the Divine in Him were too apt to be thought of as in contrast and opposition to each other, with the result that in general the human was hidden and lost in the Divine. Against this Docetic tendency of the old Christology, historical criticism has been moving in the direction of doing fuller justice to the genuine humanity of our Lord by insisting that the Divine in Him—if Divine there was—must be approached and understood through the human, as it was through the human alone that it could manifest itself.

Not from the Christological point of view only, however, but also in a twofold practical reference, is the new emphasis on the 'historic Jesus' of importance at the present day.

First, from the point of view of Christian missions. Not in Israel alone, but wherever man is feeling after God if haply he may find Him, there is

to be recognized the immanent working of God preparing the way for the fuller light of Christianity. The Western formulation of the Christian faith, however, may appear strange and alien to the modes of thought of other lands. What they want is not our doctrinal construction of Christ or our theories of Atonement; they want to see Jesus for themselves, the Jesus of history who has come 'not to destroy, but to fulfil' the religious longings of their nature, and to bring them to God.

Second, from the point of view of the present demand for social reform. If 'liberty,' the first of the three great watchwords of the French Revolution, was the battle-cry of the nineteenth century, 'brotherhood,' the last of its watchwords, is the rallying cry of the beginning of the twentieth. In the midst of the present social and industrial unrest, men say, 'Let us get behind the Christ of the Churches to the Jesus of history.' 'We would see Jesus'—the human Jesus, the man of Nazareth and Galilee, the friend and brother of the poor and the oppressed.

The genuine humanity of Jesus, however, being recognized as our starting-point, can we rest with that and say that 'Jesus never outstepped the limits of the purely human.' Such is the position of the historical evolutionary school. Bousset, for example, holds that historical research has shown that Jesus throughout His life placed Himself on the side of man, and not on the side of God. He never made Himself the object of faith. He was at most but its first and greatest subject. So the absolute value of Christ for faith is denied, and Christianity reduced to one religion by the side of other religions which have appeared in history—the highest, indeed, that has yet appeared, but not necessarily final and absolute.

Can the absoluteness of Christianity, and of Jesus Christ, then, not be conserved. This is the issue at present between a 'full' and a 'reduced' Christology; and towards deciding this issue the most recent movements of historical criticism itself contribute not a little. The tendency in 'liberal' thought has been to narrow the basis of Christology to the Synoptic Gospels; and even within the Synoptics to limit it to the oldest evangelic tradition that is critically ascertainable. But even in this oldest tradition, as Harnack and others admit, Jesus is given a unique and absolute significance. He is not simply a man, not even the greatest of men, but God manifest in the flesh. He represents not the ascent of man, but the descent of God. Historical criticism itself has destroyed the fiction that there was ever a time in the history of the Church when it held the 'religion of Jesus' as distinct from the 'gospel of Christ.' As far back as one can go we find only faith in and worship of a risen and glorified Christ, and Wellhausen's attempt in his Synoptic researches to get behind apostolic tradition and the 'Christ of faith' to a merely human prophetic Jesus has broken down.

Recent thought, accordingly, has been compelled to recognize that between the teaching of Jesus and that of Paul there is an essential continuity. The latter is but an unfolding of what is already implicit in the former. The apostle's teaching has, indeed, elements in it which are plainly derived from rabbinical Judaism and from the exigencies of his own dialectic, but these affect its form rather than its content; and the attempt of Wrede and others to find a deep gulf between the Synoptic 'religion of Jesus' and the Pauline 'gospel of Christ' must be dismissed as unsuccessful.

Further, it is being increasingly recognized that for a 'full' Christology and an adequate representation of the Person and Work of Christ there is demanded a wider basis than negative criticism has in the past admitted. The impression which Jesus made upon His followers is itself an element in the estimate which must be formed of Him. And much of 'liberal' Christianity is in this plight: that, if its interpretation of Jesus is true, nothing is left to explain how such an impression could have arisen.

Towards reinforcing these more positive conclusions of recent historical research and helping forward the desiderated restatement of Christian doctrine, the new Philosophy—variously described as Pragmatism (James), Activism, or Vitalism (Eucken, Bergson)—with its emphasis on conscience, feeling, and will as opposed to mere intellect, will have its own contribution to make. When, with the help of the fresh knowledge and the fresh principles and methods referred to, the new synthesis has been attained it will be one in which the central Christian truth of the absoluteness of Jesus for faith will be more clearly recognized than ever—the truth which is the implicit basis and rationale of the Christian missionary enterprise—that 'in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.'

The Great Text Commentary.

Psalm cxviii. 24.

**'This is the day which the Lord hath made;
We will rejoice and be glad in it.'**

This is unmistakably a Psalm for use in the Temple worship. It was probably meant to be sung antiphonally, on some day of national rejoicing (v.[24]). A general concurrence of opinion points to the period of the Restoration from Babylon as its date, as in the case of many Psalms in this Book V., but different events connected with that restoration have been selected. The Psalm implies the completion of the Temple, and therefore shuts out any point prior to that. Delitzsch fixes on the dedication of the Temple as the occasion; but the most probable view is that which connects the Psalm with the great celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles recorded in Neh 8. In spite of the sneers of Sanballat and Tobiah, and the active hostility of the neighbouring tribes, the repair of the walls of Jerusalem had been successfully completed. The work was finished on the twenty-fifth day of the month Elul in the twenty-first year of Artaxerxes (444 B.C.). Nehemiah concludes his narrative with the words, 'And it came to pass, when all our enemies heard thereof, that all the heathen that were about us feared, and were much cast down in their own eyes: for they perceived that this work was wrought of our God' (6[16]). In the following month (Tisri) the Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated with exceptional rejoicings. 'There was exceeding great gladness' (Neh 8[14-18]). The triumphant joyousness of the Psalm, its thanksgivings for recent deliverance from the hostility of surrounding enemies, its vivid consciousness that this deliverance is due to Jehovah's help alone, correspond strikingly with the circumstances and feelings of that time, as they are delineated in the Book of Nehemiah. Baethgen, who is very slow to recognize indications of specific dates, speaks with unwonted decisiveness, when he writes, 'I believe that I can say with certainty that Psalm 118 was sung for the first time at the Feast of Tabernacles in the year 444 B.C.'

This Psalm was the thanksgiving or recessional hymn after the Passover, and was therefore sung by Christ and the Apostles at the end of the Last Supper. It is most probably the hymn they sang on the way to the Mount of Olives.[1]

I.

The Day.

'This is the day.'

1. The verse of the text is best regarded as the continuation of the choral praise in vv.[22. 23]. 'The day' is that of the festival now in process, the joyful culmination of God's manifold deliverances. It is a day in which joy is duty, and no heart has a right to be too heavy to leap for gladness. Private sorrows enough many of the jubilant worshippers no doubt had, but the sight of the Stone laid as the Head of the corner should bring joy even to such.

It would be a true thought, and a right one, every day of the year, as you open your eyes, to feel it a new-born day for a new-born soul, calling to new attainments, and new works of love; and entering upon it with a determination to be happy, and saying, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.'[2]

2. But in our Lord's time the whole of the hundred and eighteenth Psalm was applied to the Messiah by the Jewish interpreters. Christ was the Stone, refused by the builders of Israel, but afterwards made the Head of the corner. His was the welcome, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord'; to Him was addressed the prayer, 'Hosanna, save, I pray,' as on Palm Sunday, by the Jewish multitude. Thus it was very natural for the Christian Church to find in the words, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it,' an application to our Lord Jesus Christ. What was the day in His Life which He made His own, beyond all others? Not His birthday; for that meant His entrance on a life of sorrows. Not His Ascension day; for that was the closing scene of a triumph already achieved. Not His Transfiguration day; it was a momentary flash of glory in a career of pain. Not the day of His Crucifixion; it was a great day for a ruined world, but for Him it marked the lowest stage of humiliation

[1] C. L. Marson, *The Psalms at Work*, 261.
[2] J. Vaughan.

and of woe. The Day of days in the life of Christ was the day of His Resurrection. It reflected new glory on the day of His Birth. It witnessed a triumph of which the Ascension was but a completion. It was to the Transfiguration what the sunrise is to the earliest dawn. It poured a flood of light and meaning on Calvary itself; and showed that what took place there was not simply the death-scene of an innocent Sufferer, but a Sacrifice which would have power with God to the end of time. Something of this kind is what was felt by the old Christians about Easter Day; and as it was the greatest day in the life of Jesus Christ, so for them it was the greatest day in the whole year. It was the day of days; it was the Lord's own day; it was the queen of festivals.

There is a little town called Feldkirch on the frontier of Austria, on the Ill, an affluent of the Rhine. It numbers under three thousand inhabitants. In the year 1799, when the armies of Napoleon were sweeping over the Continent, Massena, one of his generals, suddenly appeared on the heights above the town at the head of eighteen thousand men. It was Easter Day, and the morning sun as it rose glittered on the weapons of the French at the top of the range of hills to the west of Feldkirch. The town council hastily assembled to consult what was to be done. Defence was impossible. Should a deputation be sent to Massena with the keys of the town, and an entreaty that he should treat the place with mercy? Then the old Dean of the church stood up. 'It is Easter Day,' he said. 'We have been reckoning on our own strength, and that fails. It is the day of the Lord's Resurrection. Let us ring the bells and have services, as usual, and leave the matter in God's hands. We know only our own weakness, and not the power of God.' His words prevailed. Then from the three or four church towers in Feldkirch the bells began to clang in joyous peals in honour of the Resurrection, and the streets were filled with worshippers hastening to the House of God. The French heard with surprise and alarm the sudden clangour of joy-bells; and concluding that the Austrian army had arrived in the night to relieve the place, Massena suddenly broke up his camp, and before the bells had ceased ringing not a Frenchman was to be seen.[1]

3. Again, we owe to the Resurrection of our Lord one of the most wide-spread and popular of Christian institutions—the Lord's Day, or 'Sunday,' as we generally call it. We cannot better describe Sunday than in the words of the Hebrew Psalmist, 'This is the day which the Lord hath made.' It is clear that these words cannot refer primarily to an institution which did not exist until centuries after they were written. Nor are they necessarily a direct prediction of it. But they give, perhaps, the most accurate description of Sunday to be found in the Bible—a description all the more suggestive if it is undesigned. For there is no reason to think that the Lord's Day was instituted as in any sense a Christian Sabbath. It was from the very first a weekly memorial of the Resurrection, and its continued observance is the Church's abiding testimony to her belief in that supreme article of our Creed.

[1] Baring-Gould.

4. Easter Day is the parent of all days. For the Sunday is the mother of the week, and all the Sundays spring from this Sunday; and it would be well for us if we traced back all the days of the week to our Sundays, and all our Sundays to the Resurrection. They are to be congratulated who, when they wake every morning, receive life as a new creation, and take the day as something God has made especially for them.

It is a great criterion of a man's state how he meets the opening day,—whether his first thoughts are happy thoughts; whether the day rises gloomily on his mind, or whether it comes in speaking of peace, and love, and God, and happy duties, and pleasant things, for which that day is given. It is a great thing to have a resurrection, a joyful resurrection, every morning. Will not they have a blessed rising by and by from the sleep of death, who arise every morning as on the wing from the death of sleep?

Saint Simon, the famous courtier of Louis XIV., used to greet himself in the morning with these words, 'Get up, M. le Comte! you have great things to do to-day.'

So here hath been dawning
Another blue Day;
Think wilt thou let it
Slip useless away.

Out of Eternity
This new Day is born;
Into Eternity,
At night, will return.

Behold it aforetime
No eye ever did;
So soon it forever
From all eyes is hid.

Here hath been dawning
Another blue Day;
Think wilt thou let it
Slip useless away.[2]

[2] Thomas Carlyle.

II.

It is a Day of Divine Victory.

'Which the Lord hath made.'

It was a day of victory for Israel, a day of celebration due to the deliverance wrought by Jehovah.

1. It was a *victory over doubt.* There had been abundant faint-heartedness among even the restored exiles. The nations around had scoffed at these 'feeble Jews,' and the scoffs had not been without echoes in Israel itself. Chiefly the men of position and influence, who ought to have strengthened drooping courage, had been infected with the tendency to rate low the nation's power, and to think that their enterprise was destined to disaster. But now the Temple is built, and the worshippers stand in it. What does that teach but that all has been God's doing? So wonderful is it, so far beyond expectation, that the very objects of such marvellous intervention are amazed to find themselves where they stand. So rooted is our tendency to unbelief that, when God does what He has sworn to do, we are apt to be astonished with a wonder which reveals the greatness of our past incredulity. No man who trusts God ought to be surprised at God's answers to trust.

We are told that the sun is nearest to us in winter, when it seems farthest away: so I comfort myself with the thought that God is often closest to us when we are coldest and He is most invisible. There is much that we cannot explain, which we may never explain. The more we think, the harder are the problems. But I look for light to the Lamb on the Cross, and there I learn that God *is*, that God is Love, that God is Light. Do you say: 'Ah! but there are so few signs of the day; the clouds are so dark, men around us are groping and losing their way; worst of all we ourselves are not sure of the path'? It is only too true. For narrow is the gate, strait is the way, and few there be that find it. But John Bunyan, in his *Pilgrim's Progress*, has told us that even when we cannot see the way, we yet may see the Light of the Cross in the distance. 'Then said Evangelist, pointing with his finger over a very wide field, Do you see yonder wicket-gate? The man said, No. Then said the other, Do you see yonder shining light? He said, I think I do. Then said Evangelist, Keep that light in your eye.'[1]

2. It was a *victory over the world.* Israel was but a feeble handful. Its very existence seemed to depend on the caprice of the protecting kings who had permitted its return. It had had bitter experience of the unreliableness of a monarch's whim. Now, with superb reliance, which was felt by the Psalmist to be the true lesson of the immediate past, it peals out its choral confidence in Jehovah with a 'heroism of faith which may well put us to the blush.' Faith in Jehovah makes men independent of human helpers. Fear of and confidence in men are both removed by trust in God.

In the risen Christ have we the victory over the world. Let us only put off the world, and we put on Christ. As children say to themselves, 'This is the spring,' or 'This is the sea,' trying to grasp the thought, and not let it go; as travellers in a foreign land say, 'This is that great city,' or 'This is that famous building,' knowing it has a long history through centuries, and vexed with themselves that they know so little about it; so let us say, This is the Day of days, the Royal Day, the Lord's Day. Christ entered into His rest, and so do we. We have had enough of weariness and dreariness, and listlessness, and sorrow and remorse. We have had enough of this troublesome world. We have had enough of its noise and din. Noise is its best music. But now there is stillness; and it is a stillness that speaks. We know how strange the feeling is of perfect silence after continued sound. Such is our blessedness now. Calm and serene days have begun; and Christ is heard in them, and His still small voice, because the world speaks not.[2]

3 It was a *victory over circumstances.* The very life of Israel as a nation was threatened. The enemy thrust sore with intent to make Israel fall. But now the trials are recognized to be from Jehovah. It is He who has corrected, severely indeed, but still 'in measure, not to bring to nothing, but to make capable and recipient of fuller life.' It is beautiful that all thought of human foes has faded away, and God only is seen in all the sorrow.

If we have a fresh and vivid feeling of Christ's nearness, if His presence is to us a blessed reality, each day will be for us a day of victory over circumstances. Sickness, death, the loss of friends, the opposition of those who have no true faith in and love for Jesus Christ, the bad tempers, the prejudices, the follies of those around us, the troubles and heartaches of the natural life, remain as before. But they no longer absorb attention. The eye of the soul is turned upward; it is fixed on the Divine and the Eternal. These outward troubles still have their importance. But they are seen in their true proportions; they do not obscure the higher realities. They are not feared.

[1] Forbes Robinson, *College and Ordination Addresses*, 140.

[2] J. H. Newman.

In 1745, Louis Rang, the brother of a minister who only saved himself from the scaffold by flight, a young man of twenty-five years of age, and himself a minister of the Protestant religion, was arrested at Livron. He was thrown into prison at Valence, and condemned to die at Grenoble, March 2nd, 1745. In vain the President of the Court had offered him his life if he would abjure his faith. He had rejected all offers. His sentence was that he should be hung in the market-place at Dié, and that his head should be severed from his body and exposed on a gibbet opposite the little inn at Livron, where he had been arrested. On his way to the scaffold, he sang v.[24] of Ps 118. His voice was drowned by the roll of drums. With his eyes raised to heaven, he reached the foot of the scaffold, fell on his knees in prayer, then mounted the ladder and met his death.

A few weeks later, Jacques Roger, a venerable man of seventy years of age, forty of which he had spent as a Protestant pastor, was betrayed to the government and arrested. Ordained at Würtemburg, and therefore one of the few regularly ordained ministers, he had braved the law which made it a capital offence to return to France. For forty years he had escaped, often by a hair's breadth, the pursuit of the soldiers, who had tracked him like a wild beast. The officer in command asked him who he was. 'I am he,' he replied, 'whom you have sought for thirty-nine years; it was time that you should find me.' Condemned to death at Grenoble, he spent his last hours in encouraging some Protestant prisoners to be true to their faith. When the executioner and his assistants arrived to take him to the place of execution, he received the summons cheerfully, quoting the same verse which Louis Rang had sung on the scaffold (Ps 118[24]).[1]

III.

It is a Day of Gladness.

'We will rejoice and be glad in it.'

The Israelites 'leaped for joy'; they 'danced for joy' because of the victory that Jehovah had wrought. It was the manifestation of a gladness which filled and overflowed the whole being. Theirs was a joy that could not be restrained. Yet the 'day' in which unmingled gladness inspires our songs had not yet dawned, fair as were the many days which Jehovah had made. If sadness was ingratitude and almost treason then, what sorrow should now be so dense that it cannot be pierced by the Light which lighteth every man? The joy of the Lord should float, like oil on stormy waves, above our troublous sorrows, and smooth their tossing.

Our religion must be joyful because we have Christ with us, and therefore cannot choose but sing, as a lark cannot choose but carol. 'Religion has no power over us, but as it is our happiness,' and we shall never make it our happiness, and therefore never know its beneficent control, until we lift it clean out of the low region of outward forms and joyless service, into the blessed heights of communion with Jesus Christ, 'whom having not seen we love.'

1. It was the *gladness of reaction*, a reaction from anxiety and sorrow, doubts and trials.

So it was at the time of Christ's Resurrection. The Apostles had been crushed by the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ. They could not have imagined beforehand that One so popular, so powerful, so gifted, so good, would die like a malefactor amid the execrations of the populace, and be buried away out of sight. They had trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel. Their disappointment, their despondency, their anguish, were exactly proportioned to their earlier hopes, and, as is always the case in the life of feeling, one deep answered to another. When He was in His grave all seemed over, and when He appeared first to one and then to another on the day of His Resurrection they could not keep their feelings of welcome and delight, traversed though these were by a sense of wondering awe, within anything like bounds. 'Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.' Their joy at seeing Him corresponded to the agony which had preceded it. The rebound was proportioned to the recoil.

Our joy will sometimes be made sweeter and more wonderful by the very presence of the mourning and the grief. Just as the pillar of cloud, that glided before the Israelites through the wilderness, glowed into a pillar of fire as the darkness deepened, so, as the outlook around becomes less and less cheery and bright, and the night falls thicker and thicker, what seemed to be but a thin grey wavering column in the blaze of the sunlight will gather warmth and brightness at the heart of it when the midnight comes. You cannot see the stars at twelve o'clock in the day; you have to watch for the dark hours ere heaven is filled with glory. And so sorrow is often the occasion for the full revelation of the joy of Christ's presence.[2]

The very saddest man that ever lived was our Lord Jesus Christ; but that truth enfolds another—the very gladdest man that ever walked the earth was this same Jesus. This is not contradictory. The capacity for grief is the measure of the capacity for gladness. The depth is the height. He who never sinks never soars. The keen sensitiveness to sorrow is also and necessarily the keen sensitiveness, in every healthy soul, to joy. He who sank as no other did to darkest depths of sorrow, rose as no

[1] R. E. Prothero, *The Psalms in Human Life*, 225.

[2] A. Maclaren, *A Year's Ministry*, 145.

other could to sunny heights of bliss. The tide that goes furthest out, leaving stretches of sand and shaggy rocks to be smitten by the fierce sun, is the tide that comes furthest in, sweeping with its force far up the coast, whilst it laughs and sings in its strength and fulness. The perfect human nature of our Lord, having every faculty developed perfectly, had this in its completeness—*the faculty of gladness*. Think of Adam standing upon the earth, the God-made man, with everything within him so attuned that every breath and influence of earth broke into music as it touched him and went up to heaven in praise. So stands the Second Adam, the sinless Man Christ Jesus, His life a perfect harmony; a soul whose every string responded perfectly to the touch of God's finger.[1]

2. It was the gladness of a great *certainty of present blessing*. Jehovah had answered His people; they were standing again in His house; they were conscious of His favour. So the disciples were glad when they saw the Lord; not because they saw Him only, but because they knew He was with them. Their sight was an assurance of His presence, and so brought them joy.

Count up all sources of gladness;—there is none that can compare with the consciousness of God's favour. 'Thy favour is better than life.' When He saith, 'Well done, good and faithful servant,' we do enter into the joy of the Lord. As surely as the sunshine can chase away dull winter, and deck the earth with beauty, and cover once again the bare black trees with foliage, and fill the hedgerows with flowers, and give to the dull fields the rich promise of the harvest—so surely can the gracious shining of God's favour fill the soul with deepest peace and richest joy. To walk hand in hand with Him is Paradise restored. Do we not all of us know what it is to feel the fever of our life rebuked; and as the burden of care falls from the shoulders, we rest in such a blessed sense of God's love to us that we wonder whether doubt or fear can ever find a cranny through which again to creep?

3. It was the gladness of *confidence for future service*. Israel would yet serve God, and draw the nations into the community of God's people. God had a work for His chosen people, and He deemed them fit to perform it.

The risen Christ calls us not only to begin a new life, but to go on with it, with renewed zeal and carefulness. Let us be of good courage. Day by day we shall find that our steps are not in vain; we shall find that we can do what we once thought impossible. We shall find that that way of serving God with a perfect heart, which seemed so difficult, becomes not only easy, but the very joy of our hearts.

To have the heart to do a great good and the power is the fulfilling of our joy. Conscious fitness for the work that God has appointed us means a great joy in it. What a man can do well he can do easily, says Ruskin; and what he can do well, he does gladly. He is no true and healthy worker who does not find in his work a joy, an inspiration, a triumph.

> Give me to sleep, give me to wake
> Girded and shod, and bid me play
> The hero in the coming day.[2]

[1] Mark Guy Pearse, *Short Talks for the Times*, 226.

[2] R. L. Stevenson.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

It is not proposed to discuss the Second Part of the *Pilgrim's Progress* in anything like the same fulness with which the First Part was treated. This and the following articles are mere sketches, with suggestions for study, and notes upon such parts of the allegory as are new in this part.

The *sequel* is, and must always be, an all but irresistible temptation to writers whose books have sprung from living imagination. Nothing in our literary history is more natural, or more touching, than the tears which Charles Dickens shed at the death of Little Nell; and the parting with the children of one's imagination must be like the breaking up of an old home. Yet, with some notable exceptions, such continuations are seldom as successful as the original story. Dumas and Thackeray have perhaps been more fortunate in their sequels than most writers, and Hugo's great Trilogy, while the characters are different in each of its parts, has attained a completeness of guiding principle which sets it apart by itself. On the other hand, Meredith has found few who love his

second parts as well as his first, and George MacDonald probably none. The most successful plan would seem to be that of those writers who, like Shakespeare and many others, introduce old characters which they feel they have not exhausted, singly into quite new stories and surroundings.

As to Bunyan's great story, opinions have always differed as to the merits of the Second Part. The usual verdict is probably on the whole unfavourable,[1] although H. C. Benson, in his chapter on the book in *Beside Still Waters*, has made himself the enthusiastic champion of Christiana and her fortunes. And, indeed, if any story ever needed a continuation, it was this. The exigencies of the allegory required Christian to leave his home, but the forsaken wife and family have to be reckoned with. We have already seen how groundless are the accusations of selfishness in the religion which thus leaves all to follow Christ. But the recurring mention of the family left behind in the City of Destruction, has already whetted our curiosity as to their ultimate career,[2] and at the close of the earlier part there is a virtual promise of more to follow.

Bunyan himself, at least, opens his sequel with no false modesty. The telling of the former dream, he says, was 'pleasant to me and profitable to you,' and he proceeds to explain, in the most business-like fashion, that 'through the multiplicity of business,' he has been 'kept back from his wonted travels into those parts,' but now, 'having had some concerns that way of late, I went down again thitherward.' As a matter of fact, his first idea was 'to complete the picture by a contrast.' Two years after the publication of Part I., and immediately after its third edition had appeared, he began *The Life and Death of Mr. Badman*,[3] with that intent. But Mr. Badman could be no proper sequel to the tale of Christian, and indeed, like a kind of Frankenstein's monster, he may well have terrified even his creator. At all events, he did not satisfy him, and Christiana was still upon his heart and remembrance. He had hesitated about publishing the first part, and had consulted his friends, with varying result. 'Some said, John, print it; others said, Not so!' Still more varied, and not less frank, were the opinions of his friends as to the publishing of a sequel. But John Bunyan, though he much valued the advice of friends, yet was one of those who in the end must rely upon his own judgment. The first part had immediate and enormous success, and in three years ran into seven editions. But it was not till 1684, six years after the former publication, that the second part appeared. In this interval he had written (besides *Mr. Badman*) *The Fear of God*, *Come and Welcome to Jesus Christ*, and *The Holy War*. They were six busy years, for at that time John Bunyan was the most popular preacher in England, and he was engaged in much pastoral work besides.

From what has been already stated, certain points of contrast are already manifest. The first part was written in prison, the second in freedom. The first had leisure about it for meditation, while the second was the product of intervals in an excessively busy life. The first is more spontaneous, upon the simple impulse of the author, while the second, being written after criticism and suggestion, such as are described in the Author's Apology to it, is more or less avowedly supplementary to the former part. The first part is, accordingly, the more natural, while the second, being more ambitious as literature, and so more conscious, is distinctly less valuable for those rare literary qualities which have made the first part so famous. On the whole, Part II. is more stately and religious, but it is less natural and human. One often feels that the writer was under the necessity of getting something more to say, and as there was nothing really lacking, he had to invent such novelties as the perfumed and gold-lettered epistle sent from the King to Christiana—a kind of addition more in the style of Part III. than of John Bunyan, and altogether irrelevant in the story of these pilgrims.

The Story.

The story begins with a dream, this time in a wood about a mile off the *den* of the former dream, a touch of narration done in the exact fashion of the old *Chansons*. A new figure, Mr. Sagacity, appears, and begins the tale with an epitome of Christian's adventures, for which service doubtless he was invented. Christiana[4] is introduced in her loneliness, troubled both by remorse for her treatment of her husband, and by anxiety for her own soul. She, too, like her husband, is disturbed by visions of the night. First she dreams of that

[1] Cf. Kerr Bain and Froude on this question.
[2] *E.g.* Charity in the House Beautiful, etc.
[3] Cf. Brown, *John Bunyan*, ii. 23, 25.
[4] Brown, *John Bunyan*, ii. 28.

parchment on which the deeds of the past are recorded; then of devils, plotting to tempt her with the world away from her serious thought, and then of Christian in heaven upon that same 'paved work of a sapphire,' which Browning has described in his *One Word More.* It is an interesting and characteristic sidenote of Bunyan's to the passage about the devils, 'Mark this, this is the quintessence of hell.'

Then follows the visit of the heavenly messenger Secret, and the mother and children resolve to start on pilgrimage. Neighbours visit her—young Mercy, and Mrs. Timorous, daughter of the man whom Christian met on the Hill Difficulty. The expected conversation follows, in which Mrs. Timorous dilates upon the horrors of the journey, quotes Obstinate and Pliable as wise men (though we know how Pliable was regarded in the city after his return), and concludes by an appeal to the thought of the 'four sweet babes.' Christiana's answer is an argument which such a neighbour may be supposed to understand, showing that the pilgrimage will pay, in spite of all its dangers. Mercy, who has been silent, is resolved to have more talk with Christiana, and to go with her 'if she find truth and life' in what she hears. Mrs. Timorous is lost sight of in a gossiping party, whose talk is rapidly becoming indecent; and Mercy, with much hesitation or self-distrust, consents to go as Christiana's servant as far as the Wicket Gate, and to decide as to further pilgrimage by her reception there. So they all set out, Mercy weeping because of the condition in which she must leave her relations, but singing some very sweet and simple verses as she goes. At the Slough of Despond they manage to find the steps, and cross safely, though in a somewhat slippery and precarious fashion. At the Wicket Gate they knock for a long time, being answered only by the savage barking of the dog, which is explained in a sidenote as 'the devil, an enemy to prayer.' Mercy has longer to wait than the rest, but at length, after Christiana's prayer for her, and her own desperate knock and swooning, she is admitted, and restored by a restorative bundle of myrrh. At the Wicket Gate they see a distant view of the Cross, and so pass on. As they pass the devil's garden, the boys pluck some fruit from the overhanging branches of trees, and persist in so doing in spite of their mother's chiding. There follows the incident of the assault of two Ill-favoured Ones who are the same that Christiana had seen and heard in her dream, previous to the journey. The Reliever comes in answer to their crying out, and delivers them, upon which they learn that they should have asked for a conductor. The design of this part of the story seems to be to enforce the danger of that part of the journey nearest to conversion. The devil seems to be everywhere about the region, with his castle and sharp-shooters, his garden, his dog, and his ill-favoured ones. The pilgrims accordingly here fall into their first blunders and learn their earliest lessons of experience.

The Allegory.

It will be seen, in this opening section, that there is a certain new elaboration, and a want of that simple spontaneity which is so characteristic of the earlier story. Mr. Sagacity is an unnecessary and altogether conventional figure. Dr. Brown recalls the similar introductory speaker in the Prologues of Euripides.[1] It is a device common in the old Romances, which seem never able to get begun, on account of the 'legend about the legend,' as Pater aptly calls this preliminary part. Bunyan evidently feels this, and, finding that Mr. Sagacity must be got rid of, dismisses him rather clumsily just before they come to the Wicket Gate. We are not sorry to part with him, for he has so drawn the allegory in among the romances as to exaggerate the defects of the former part, especially in his spectacular account of Christian in the Celestial City.

Yet in the main the people speak with that old crisp forthrightness which has grown so familiar and so charming to readers of the first part. The City of Destruction is 'a populous place, but possessed with a very ill-conditioned and idle sort of people.' 'Better and better, quoth I. But what! wife and children and all?' Many instances of the same raciness and vitality of interest might be quoted. And the incidents impress us in the same way as formerly with the sense that he who describes them is writing from the memory of what he has actually seen with his eyes. The ill-favoured ones meet the pilgrims 'when they were gone *about two bow shots* from the place,' and so on.

[1] *John Bunyan*, xi.

Allegorical writing is apt to become childish and unreal,[1] and it is a curious weapon in the hands of this great strong plain man. It is mingled with touches of the writer's personal history. He has a multiplicity of business which compels him to take up his lodgings here and there. The determination to link in the second with the first part is manifest, not in the general story alone, but in the introduction of such already familiar personages as the Timorous family and Madame Wanton. The introduction of new matter is apt to be grotesque, as in the perfumed letter of Secret, and the trumpeter, introduced without any apparent reason, at the Wicket Gate. The allegory is also somewhat more conventional in form, as we have seen from the introduction of Mr. Sagacity, and from the dream in the wood. The devil-dog is another instance of this, and recalls the widespread convention which finds its most popular instance in the hound of Goethe's *Faust*. The veil between the allegorical and the spiritual, too, is thinner. Such sentences as 'The King delighteth in Mercy,' 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' and 'Damsel, I bid thee arise' are examples of that breaking through of the meaning which R. L. Stevenson has discussed so excellently from the literary point of view in his essay on Bunyan.

The Character-Drawing.

All the psychological and human work is memorable. There are traces of what would now be considered a somewhat superior and discourteous estimate of women, but there is abundant compensation in the delicate touches which reveal the eternal feminine. New and clever phrases, and a fresh vivacity and interest, light up the conversations continually. Mercy, for instance, parting with Mrs. Timorous, 'thinks to walk this sunshiny morning a little with Christiana, to help her on her way'; and Christiana is 'glad at her heart, not only that she had a companion, but also for that she had prevailed with this poor maid to fall in love with her own salvation.' Each of the characters is distinct, and is consistently sustained throughout.

Mr. Sagacity, so long as he lasts, is true to his name. His breezy account of the fame which Christian had won even in Destruction, is quite in keeping with the popular mind, whose love of praise he knows. It is as if he said, 'You who love praise, why choose the momentary and neglect the lasting good opinion even of the world?' One remembers in this connexion Bunyan's own statement, 'When I went out to seek the Bread of Life, some of them would follow me, and the rest be put into a muse at home. Yea, almost all the town at first would go out to hear at the place where I found good.'[2]

Mrs. Timorous is equally distinct. 'I knocked, as you know is our custom'—a very proper lady, whose only conscience, indeed, is her propriety. Yet the moral value of such timorous propriety is pitilessly exposed immediately. This book is one long protest against fear, and at this point we see it exposed in its twofold temptation of loneliness and the unknown; and in its contemptible refuge of respectability.

The children are, at first, naturally keen for the journey; and their early piety will run some risk of landing them in priggishness. But the author knows this quite well, and, to our great relief, makes them eat the tempting fruit, and go on eating it after their mother's remonstrance. There is plenty of hope that these boys will prove good company after all.

Mercy is, from first to last, an admirably imagined character. She is against the journey at first, and no wonder, considering its danger to her friends. Even in Destruction she was true to her name, but uneducated Mercy is always a sad blunderer. Natural kindliness needs to be converted to a nobler mercy. In the company of the regular pilgrims she feels herself something of an alien, and her self-distrust is finely blended with her pity for the relations she is leaving behind. There is something peculiarly tender and affecting in this gentle modesty. 'Had I as good ground to hope for a loving reception at the gate as you, I think no Slough of Despond would discourage me.' The saying reminds us of the eternal pathos of Virgil's words to Dante in the *Purgatorio*.[3]

Christiana is already a notable woman, of firmly drawn character and many-sided human interest. She had despised her husband and treated him atrociously while she had him, but the empty chair is wonderfully eloquent, so that even the uncouth language and behaviour of one whose sincerity we despised, become an intolerable reproach after our

[1] Cf. Snell, *The Fourteenth Century*, pp. 34, 117.

[2] Cf. Brown, *John Bunyan*, chap. vi.

[3] Cantos vii., xxvii., xxx.

chance is gone. Christiana, at this stage, does not understand the language of heaven, and yet feels its beauty. But a letter of personal invitation comes to her: and she would need it, after her past conduct. Her heart, like every Christian heart, echoes the fear:

> So vile I am, how dare I hope to stand,
> In the pure glory of that holy land?

She desires to go, though she knows it will be no easy passage; nor has she any thought of being 'carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease.' From the first, she reckons with the hardships of pilgrimage, and will have it on the same terms as her husband. There is in her a touch of the Rationalist, strong in intellect rather than sweet in affections like Mercy. She cannot but question why the Man at the Wicket Gate keeps such a dog; and again, after the incident of the Ill-favoured Ones, she wonders, 'since our Lord knew it would be for our profit that He sent not one along with us.' Altogether this is a strong-minded woman who thinks for herself and takes life strenuously. What the Ill-favoured Ones stand for —unless they may be memories of some wilder days of her youth—we cannot well say. Certainly her temptations will not usually be towards sins of frailty, though sins of harshness and self-will may have some troubles in store for her.

The Religious Teaching.

There is the ominous background of Judgment and Retribution, and the sense of enemies, here as formerly. To begin with, 'The King will know the reason . . . why Christian's neighbours set so little by him,' to which Bunyan adds the sidenote, 'Christian's King will take Christian's part.' All men are accountable for the treatment they give to true souls, and when the incident is closed, the matter is not yet over. When a sincere pilgrim has dwelt in any neighbourhood, his neighbours will sooner or later have to answer for it whether they made it easier or more difficult for him to live there. Again, there is a protest against false comforters in the statement that at the Slough there are 'Many that pretend to be the King's labourers, and that say they are for mending the King's Highway, that bring dirt and dung instead of stones, and so mar instead of mending.'[1] Finally, there is the unaccountable dog, and the questions that his presence awakens. It is the old question, 'Why does not God kill Satan?' which has exercised the minds of old and young through so many generations. The German story of the answer, 'From love to thee, my child,' is beautiful, but it leaves the mystery unsolved. And so must Bunyan. 'The dog has another owner' is all the solution he attempts, leaving the conflicting forces of good and evil to their essential and inscrutable mystery. Yet he adds one word. All this unstable balance of power is but for a time, and, through evil and good both, God is working out His purpose. 'I take all at present patiently,' says the Man at the Gate.[2] A Syrian Christian, describing some years ago the injustice of the Mohammedan rule, added, with an access of eagerness, 'But God waits!' It is an assurance which frequently comforted the Psalmists.

The reality of spiritual experience is finely taught by the visit of Secret and the Wicket Gate. Secret, the name and the messenger both, is a touch of genius. At such a time, when the purposes and destinies alike are in equipoise, something is needed (in Professor William James' memorable phrase) to 'tilt the plane'[3] towards good. We believe that there is spiritual backing for all our good impulses and desires, and at such a moment it is of supreme importance that we should be made aware of that help from on high. Whether such a sense of support be regarded as the work of some angel visitor, or of the Holy Spirit of God Himself, is of little moment, so long as the reinforcement is experienced, and our feet are set in the way of peace. The Wicket Gate is, as in Christian's case, the point of outward crisis, dividing the past from the future in one clearly defined choice, backed again by a divine act of reception. Mercy is wise in staking all her fortunes on the one point of her admission at that gate. The reception there is slightly elaborated from the simplicity of Christian's experience, probably with a view to clear up any doubt that the former story may have left in the minds of readers as to the relation between the Gate and the Cross. The separation between the two had probably given rise to criticism, and here the problem is solved by the device of Good-will's having the pilgrims to the top of the gate, and showing them the Cross further on the road. 'I grant pardon,' said he, 'by

[1] Cf. Nathaniel Hawthorne's *Celestial Railroad*, sub loco.

[2] Cf. Benson, *Beside Still Waters*, s.l.

[3] *The Will to Believe.*

word and deed.' The words are at the gate, the deed was on the Cross. Mercy has to knock longer and more vehemently than her friend, since she has not received the same sense of personal invitation as Christiana. Yet it is worth while to knock there for a lifetime, for the alternative is to turn back. Here, as before, that is the great sin,—a fundamental note of the whole *Pilgrim's Progress*. In the incident of the deliverance from the Ill-favoured Ones, the pilgrims are not allowed to go back even to confess their mistake and ask for a conductor: and, indeed, of them as truly as of Christian, it is true, 'Go back they durst not.' But Mercy learns yet another lesson. Not only is going back forbidden. Lying prone is also wrong. She is told to arise, and when she pleads her faintness, she receives the answer, 'Fear not, but stand upon thy feet.'[1] It is to the erect in spirit, who dare to take life and all it may bring standing, that all gates open in the end. There follows a passage whose beauty is equalled by its breadth of Christian charity, and which is one of Bunyan's richest gems: 'And if there is any grace or forgiveness to spare, I beseech that I, thy poor handmaid, may be partaker thereof. Then he took her again by the hand, and led her gently in, and said, I pray for all them that believe on me, by what means soever they come unto me.' There is no possibility of mistaking the personality of this speaker. The words have in them all the breadth of human nature and divine love that mankind has found in Jesus Christ. And they are spoken to one who, hitherto, has had no personal assurance of her welcome there. Not on such assurances, but on the fact of knocking and the heart of Christ, does our acceptance at the gate depend.

There is much teaching about prayer in this passage. Outside the gate 'they betook themselves to a short debate about how they must manage their calling at the gate,' and the sidenote tells us that 'Prayer should be made with consideration.' It is well to remember that we should think before we pray, for that will save us from many disappointments, and not a little bewilderment as to whether prayer is answered. Yet when it comes to the act of prayer itself, we cannot, by prayers borrowed from others, hope to prevail. One of the remarkable passages in *Down in Water Street*, the story of the Jerry Macaulay Mission in New York, is that in which the penitent asks the Christian worker to pray for him, and is told 'You must pray for yourself.' So here, Christiana begins her intercession for Mercy, but is interrupted by Mercy's own knocking. It is a principle of the most vital truth in all such circumstances. Later on, in the bold and curious conversation between Christiana and the Reliever, as to the absence of a conductor, it appears that the Lord had in kindness suffered them to be without a conductor that they might learn both the need and the use of prayer,—''Tis a poor thing that is not worth asking for.' And so, here as so often elsewhere, 'There is some soul of goodness in things evil'; and the incident ends in a most pleasant optimism as to the lessons which may be derived even from our blunders, and the blessings that may eventually come to us along the dark and sordid pathway of our sins. The Reliever is a bright figure, undefined and difficult to identify, but carrying with him an atmosphere of hopefulness and a sense of well-being. He reminds us more of Help, to whom Christian was indebted at the Slough, than of any other figure. But the habit of making the best of existing circumstances, and looking on the bright side of experience, is native to Christiana. 'Now we are in, we are in, and I am glad with all my heart,' she says, after the adventure of the dog. It was Formalist and Hypocrisy from whom on the last occasion we heard these words, 'If we are in, we are in.' But there is all the difference in the world between the two optimisms. Theirs is but the result of desire to believe themselves safe; hers is that of one who knows her salvation. You cannot reconstruct the universe and pronounce it 'all very good'; but you can get God to reconstruct your soul, and then the universe somehow comes right.

[1] Cf. Ezk 2^1.

Literature.

ROBERTSON AND PLUMMER ON FIRST CORINTHIANS.[1]

Like Romans, First Corinthians appears in the 'International Critical Commentary' under a double editorship. The difficulties of this method are almost as obvious as its drawbacks. Still, when each author accepts general responsibility for the work, the requisite unity of impression is preserved. As a matter of fact, it is only here and there (*e.g.* on page xxviii) that readers of the present volume have any indication of who is the particular contributor. Both have done a piece of conscientious and careful exegesis, which needed to be done. Since Professor Findlay's edition in the Expositor's Greek Testament we have had no English work on the Greek text of the Epistle which would put students abreast of the relevant problems, or, at any rate, make them aware of such problems. This edition fills the gap usefully, and English readers now possess notes on the Epistle which aim at serving them as the notes of Heinrici, J. Weiss, and Bachmann serve the present generation of German students.

The fashion of commentaries alters wonderfully little, but one must single out the paraphrastic translations prefixed to each section of the Epistle by our editors as a feature of real excellence. It is a distinct help to have such paraphrases. Only, it is not often that they are a success. Lightfoot sowed the seed; but while his imitators have been numerous, they have not found it so easy to raise the flower as perhaps they imagined. Bishop Robertson and Dr. Plummer have achieved much better results than the large majority of other editors in this line of business; they are entitled to special praise for the qualities of suggestiveness and adequacy which their introductory sections frequently exhibit.

A second characteristic of the edition is the attention paid to what may be called questions of Christian doctrine. First Corinthians brings out Paul's practical judgment more than almost anything else. As the editors admit, it is not a doctrinal treatise like Romans; 'nor is it, like Galatians, the document of a crisis involving far-reaching doctrinal consequences. It deals with the practical questions affecting the life of a Church founded by the writer: one great doctrinal issue, arising out of circumstances at Corinth (xv. 12), is directly treated; but doctrine is, generally speaking, implied or referred to rather than enforced. Yet, none the less, the doctrinal importance and instructiveness of the letter can hardly be overrated.' The notes repeatedly present materials for the discussion of such doctrinal issues in the light of modern Christianity, even at places where real problems of Paulinism almost demand prior notice. Naturally one of the most prominent issues which reveal the dogmatic basis underneath Paul's practical judgment, is that of the Lord's Supper. It is handled with sensible moderation. Thus the editors properly decline to interpret 11^{30} of spiritual deadness. On the other hand, they are less convincing now and then, as, *e.g.*, in their refusal to see an allusion to some practice of vicarious baptism in 15^{29}. They incline to follow Professor Findlay in making οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν refer to persons who became Christians in the first instance out of affection for their beloved dead, *i.e.* to survivors who got baptized in hope of securing a reunion with departed Christian friends who 'had died, earnestly desiring and praying for their conversion.' This is ingenious, but is it natural, from the standpoint of exegesis? Surely the evidence for vicarious baptism or ritual in the Greek cults, though slight, is sufficient to justify the hypothesis of an allusion to some local adaptation of it by Corinthians desirous of safeguarding the eternal welfare of friends and relatives who had died in paganism.

Another decision which is even more surprising, is the refusal to recognize demonic powers in the ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου of 2^{6}. No other interpretation fits in naturally to the language of the paragraph, and the expression in v.[8] is far from excluding it, especially in the light of the well-known passage from the *Ascensio Isaiae*—which, by the way, is not unlikely to be the source of the citation in 2^{9}, despite what is said on pp. 41–42. This is, in fact, one of the places where one misses

[1] *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians.* By the Right Rev. Archibald Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Exeter, and the Rev. Alfred Plummer, M.A., D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911. Price 12s. Pp. lxx, 424.

a reference to works like those of Everling and Dibelius upon the distinct significance of spirits, good and evil, in the Pauline cosmology; just as the general attitude to Paulinism suffers more than once from a failure to take account of authorities like Titius, Sokolowski, and Gunkel. Similarly, the discussion on the parties in the Church at Corinth would have been more satisfactory, from a critical point of view, if it had come to terms with the questions which have been ventilated in the recent essays by Rohr and Lütgert. From two Oxford editors we might also—though this is a detail—have expected a reference, on 9^{24-25}, to the striking paragraph about the corruptible crown in Pater's *Plato and Platonism* (p. 233).

However, as Dr. Johnson argued, 'it is impossible for an expositor not to write too little for some, and too much for others.' This volume, at any rate, is characterized by the same careful attention to the minutiæ of textual criticism and the interests of historical exegesis in general as the edition of *Romans* in the International Commentary. It is also admirably indexed. What it does contain is both orderly and accessible.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Broughty Ferry.

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE.

The fifth, sixth, and seventh volumes of the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge; 9s. net each) have now been issued. The seventh volume completes the Caroline Age. The rest of the ground is to be covered in seven further volumes, making altogether a total of fourteen volumes.

In a scheme of this magnitude ample scope is given for a very complete study of English literary history. Each article is, moreover, an individual and painstaking effort to combine fulness of detail and accuracy of perspective. The difficulties of specialization have been avoided and its merits retained. In the fifth volume, for example, we find six contributors engaged on the study of the English Drama. The result of these individual efforts is not only a full but also a well-balanced account of its rise and growth. There is no glaring distortion. It is a complete picture; not a succession of bright patches.

Is there any subject in dealing with which a student is more handicapped than this subject of the English Drama? And what is the reason? The chief reason is that he is under the necessity of applying to various books for information, instead of having it before him in clearness and at the same time sufficient fulness as in the *Cambridge History of English Literature*. But apart from their value for the student, these chapters are also very good reading.

The sixth and seventh volumes carry us to the end of the Caroline Age, and include the life and work of the principal dramatists down to 1642.

In his chapter on the Sacred Poets (vol. vii.), the Rev. F. E. Hutchinson has given us a remarkably complete survey of the work of this new school which developed in the Anglican Church in the second quarter of the seventeenth century. The first of these poets is Herbert. Mr. Hutchinson tells us just what it is most important for us to know of Herbert's life: where he was born; how educated; what influences led him at last to the Church, and the part that his final decision played in directing his genius into a new channel. Mr. Hutchinson discusses briefly a few of Herbert's outstanding poems, noting the defects which Herbert shared in common with the poets of the Metaphysical School. In this connexion we expected some reference to the influence of Donne on Herbert's work. For, in addition to being linked, as Mr. Hutchinson says, to his immediate contemporaries, Crashaw and Vaughan, Herbert is also connected, and as definitely, with his predecessor Donne. In his art he is a pupil of Donne. He reveals quite unmistakably the stamp of Donne's great personality and idiosyncrasies. In his extravagances Herbert is, so to speak, working after a pattern, and though he attains frequently a certain quaintness, as opposed to the repulsive distortion of some of Donne's work, yet he never reaches the passion which belongs to Donne.

Crashaw is a particularly interesting study. Mr. Hutchinson does full justice to his opportunity. To a certain extent Herbert is Jacobean in form and figure. Crashaw is most certainly Caroline. Says Mr. Hutchinson: 'There is hardly a poem by Crashaw which recalls Herbert, and the two men are widely different in temperament and genius. Crashaw's debt to the older poet is not so much technical as spiritual.' Crashaw's is a much more ardent temperament. He lacks the balance and variety of Herbert, but he has a lighter and more delicate fancy.

The same taste for symbolism, but in rather a different direction, is found in the work of Vaughan. He seeks the expression of his religious feeling in a way that anticipates Wordsworth. 'Another link with Wordsworth,' says Mr. Hutchinson, 'is Vaughan's intimate and religious feeling for nature. He has an open-air love for all natural sights and sounds, and a subtle sympathy even with the fallen timber or the stones at his feet. He is happier away from the world of men, and can rejoice equally in

Dear Night! this world's defeat, the stop to busy fools,

and in the stir that heralds the dawn. It is in his observation of nature that he achieves his most felicitous epithets—"the unthrift sun," "the pursy clouds," and "purling corn." The setting of these natural descriptions is usually religious, as in *The Rainbow* or *The Dawning*; but the lover of nature is as apparent as the mystical thinker.' He finds in nature an adequate symbolism, and a satisfying creed.

These are the outstanding figures of this new school. Of lesser followers Mr. Hutchinson mentions three—Traherne, Habington, and Quarles,—and concludes his chapter with a brief notice of their position in this great movement.

Professor Saintsbury has three chapters in this volume. One of them is on Milton. It is such a chapter as students delight in—cleverly put together and pleasant to read; yet close packed, with all the material necessary for study, but without any superfluous details. There is also a chapter on Bunyan by Dr. Brown. It occupies only about six pages. But Dr. Brown has put a life's experience into these pages. His chapter is one of the best in the volume.

EDWARD HASTINGS.

A DICTIONARY OF CHRISTIAN BIOGRAPHY.

Dr. Henry Wace, now Dean of Canterbury, has lived to see the issue, in a single volume, of an abridged edition of the great *Dictionary of Christian Biography and Literature* of which Sir William Smith and he were the original editors. He has not only lived to see its issue, but he has evidently had a considerable share in the preparation of it. For he writes the preface and his name stands on the title-page along with that of the Rev. W. C. Piercy, M.A. It is a handsome and an attractive volume of more than a thousand pages (Murray; 21s. net).

What is the nature of the abridgment? In the first place, two centuries are clean cut off. These two centuries have been cut off because, 'although they are of immense interest in the history of the Church, as including the origins of the Teutonic civilization of Europe, they have not an equal interest with the first six as exhibiting primitive Christianity in its purer forms. With the one important exception of John of Damascus, the Fathers of the Church, so called, alike in East and West, fall within the first six centuries, and in the West the series is closed by St. Gregory the Great, who died in the year 604. English divines accordingly, since the days of Bishop Jewel, have, like Bishop Cosin, appealed to the first six centuries of the Church as exhibiting, in doctrine as well as in practice, subject to Holy Scripture, the standards of primitive Christianity. Those six centuries, consequently, have a special interest for all Christian students, and particularly for those of our own Church, and deserve accordingly some special treatment.' Those are the editor's words.

But this is not all. An almost innumerable number of insignificant names have been dropped. How drastic the lopping has been in this respect may be seen in this way. The original four-volume Dictionary contains, we are told, 596 Johns. This Dictionary contains 18. And it may be said at once that, except for the purpose of mere historical reference, this Dictionary is in that respect very much the better of the two.

The great articles are retained with but little abbreviation. And that also is wisely done. Many of the authors are gone; some of those that are alive, such as the Rev. E. B. Birks, have re-read and revised their articles. New articles have been supplied. In particular the Bishop of Exeter has substituted for Pressensé's sketch of St. Augustine, a study of that great Father similar in its thoroughness to Westcott's article on Origen and Lightfoot's on Eusebius.

It is a pity that it was not found possible to retain more of the bibliographies. In all dictionary work a bibliography, selected but sufficient, rigidly revised and brought up to date, is indispensable. A good deal, however, has been done to draw

attention to the more important literature that has appeared since the issue of the original work.

We have not yet had time to test the accuracy of the work, although we know that half the value of the book depends upon that. We are content at present to let the editors' previous record speak for itself. Only one word of criticism. A summary of such an article as that on Origen, placed at the beginning of the article, would have been of immense service.

HORAE SEMITICAE.

The fifth, six, and seventh volumes of *Horae Semiticae* are occupied with 'The Commentaries of Isho'dad of Merv,' who was Bishop of Hadatha about 850 A.D. The commentaries are edited and translated by Margaret Dunlop Gibson, Hon. D.D.(Heidelberg), LL.D.(St. Andrews), M.R.A.S., and they are introduced by James Rendel Harris, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D. Volume I. contains the translation (6s. net); volume II. contains Matthew and Mark in Syriac (10s. 6d. net); and volume III. contains Luke and John in Syriac (10s. 6d. net). They are published at the Cambridge University Press.

Now it is necessary, first of all, to say that by the issue of these three handsome volumes Mrs. Gibson has proved that she belongs to the very select band of women who are great scholars. Dr. Rendel Harris confesses that he himself shrank from even a small part of the undertaking which she has accomplished, and he speaks with admiration of Mrs. Gibson's courage in attacking a work so extended and beset by so many internal difficulties.

Of the person of Isho'dad or of the worth of his exposition we need not speak. The little that is known of the man himself will be found set forth in Dr. Rendel Harris's Introduction. The commentary itself will be read with much amazement. At first it seems to be all about words. The most innocent preposition is squeezed and twisted and tortured, just as by the Inquisition, not to make it tell the truth, but to make it say what the inquisitor wants it to say. But read on. There is here a flash of real insight; there a prayer of fervent devotion. What seemed at first likely to turn one's head or bring on second childhood prematurely, proves to be true, though unfamiliar, acquaintance with the mind of God.

THE ICE AGE.

Dr. G. Frederick Wright is the author of *The Ice Age in North America* (Higham; 20s. net). Dr. Wright is not a man of science pure and simple; he is also a man of theology. Is he the worse for that? On the contrary, it is the business of every man of science to know all that can be known of God and of man's relation to God. He is less a man the less a theologian he is; and being less a man he is less a man of science. He may compel his science to conform to his theology. Ah, that is another matter. Then he is neither a theologian nor a man of science. Just as theology must take in all the facts, physical, mental, spiritual, if it is to be a reliable theology, so must science take in all the facts, spiritual, mental, material, if it is to be reliable science.

Therefore it makes nothing against Dr. Wright, but everything for him that he is a diligent student of the Bible, and that the Book of Genesis has been present to his thought throughout the writing of this volume. The subject is presented by itself. There is no intrusion of the Bible or theology. It is the book of a firm believer in God and in the inspiration of that book which Dr. Wright would not be ashamed to call the Word of God; but for all that the student can see that the Geology is Geology, sound and authoritative.

Dr. Wright has the gift of style. His particular place in the sects among which geologists are distributed does not greatly concern us. What concerns us is the ability with which he advocates his conclusions and the interest which he throws round all that he writes.

It is a great book. And it has been printed and published in a way that is worthy of its greatness. The maps and plans and photographs are produced in the most careful and finished manner.

It is unusual for an author to be able to say that his book has been read in proof by his publisher. But the publisher of the Rev. C. F. Hunter's book, *What a Christian Believes and Why* (2s.), is the Rev. J. Williams Butcher, Secretary of the Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School Department; and Mr. Butcher is a theologian as well as a publisher. His hand is seen, not in the matter of the book only, but also in the effective manner in which it has been printed.

It is a manual of divinity for Sunday School Teachers and the like, to whom order and emphasis are essential. There is perfect order here, and the important is at a glance seen to be more than the unimportant, so skilfully are the paragraphs arranged and so freely is variety of type employed. As for the author, it is enough to say that Mr. Hunter has written a book which should be named at once whenever you are consulted as to 'the best introduction to the study of theology.'

The tenth volume of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net) begins with REUSCH and ends with SON OF GOD, and these articles are almost identical in length. For the strength of the book is its biography. The greatest space in this volume, however, is given to the subject of Roman Catholicism. The German work on which this is based is distinctly confined to Protestantism. That word is not found in the title-page of the new Schaff-Herzog, but it is none the less Protestant theology that is its scope. Accordingly it was inevitable that when the word 'Roman' was reached considerable space would have to be occupied.

First of all, Philip Schaff's general article in the first edition is revised by his son, Professor D. S. Schaff, and republished. Next, Kattenbusch's article in Hauck on the Roman Catholic Church outside the United States is condensed. Then Professor Charles H. McCarthy, of the Catholic University in Washington, writes an article on Roman Catholicism in America. This ends the general subject. But a series of articles follow on related subjects—Roman Catholic Eucharistic Congresses, Roman Catholic Parochial Schools, Roman Catholic Position on the Bible in the Public Schools, and Roman Catholic Restriction of Bible Reading by the Laity.

The literatures are the most valuable of the contents of this volume as of all the others. The literature added to the history of Roman Catholicism fills five closely printed small-type columns.

There seems to be a tendency in the later volumes to give less and less space to purely Biblical topics. That is right. This book cannot compete with the great Bible Dictionaries, and its space is only wasted by the inclusion of long Biblical articles.

There is no subject that people will listen to more readily than the history of hymns—at least as a relaxation from listening to sermons. It touches three sides of some people's nature at once, the musical, the literary, and the devotional. Many books have been written for the use of the lecturer on hymns. The latest is a complete history of the subject from the Song of Moses to 'The Rivulet' of Thomas Toke Lynch. It is, of course, a mere sketch, but the author, Mr. F. J. Gillman, is a master of the subject. And it is a finished sketch. The title is *The Songs and Singers of Christendom* (Headley Brothers; 2s. net).

Here is another book on *Spiritual Power*. Its author is Mr. C. Dudley Lampen (Headley Brothers; 2s. net). Mr. Lampen is a poet as well as a prose writer, and every other chapter ends with a poem of his own composing. Well, we are promised spiritual power. There are many writers to tell us how to obtain it. Yet how few of us possess it. Neither prose nor poetry seems to do us much good in the matter. Mr. Lampen will be read—he is worth reading—but he will not do more for us than the rest have done.

There is not much reading in M. C. Fenwick's book, *The Church of Christ in Corea* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). But it is all to be read. It is a racy narrative of Mr. Fenwick's own call to foreign work and the foreign work he has accomplished, but it is more than that. It is an appeal to the Church to use fewer foreign and more native missionaries. 'The difference,' says Mr. Fenwick in one place, 'the difference between the men Pastor Sen has trained and those I have taught is, that his students have all "done well," whereas mine have all done ill.'

What we usually call Faith Healing, Dr. G. B. Cutten calls Mental Healing. He has written its history, under the title of *Three Thousand Years of Mental Healing* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is a popular history, illustrated with photographs, the photographs including John Alexander Dowie and Mary Baker Eddy. But it is a faithful history, its facts well sifted, its conclusions without prejudice.

Who would have believed at the end of the nineteenth century that by the beginning of the

second decade of the twentieth, the subject of keenest discussion in popular books and periodicals would once again be

Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute?

Dr. Frank Ballard is our most insistent and most successful writer in defence of Christianity against the infidel. And he is nothing if not popular. That is to say, he knows 'the bottom dog' as well as Mr. Blatchford knows him, and we take leave to say that he has much more sympathy with him. He writes for the multitude, even for the lower and less educated half of the multitude. And yet, the central theme of all Dr. Ballard's recent writing has been man's destiny and the freedom of his will. His latest book is entitled *Determinism: False and True* (Kelly; 6s. net).

Now the man who undertakes the public defence of Christianity in these days has to know what he is about. The atheist is still abroad. But he is much better educated than before. The Christian apologist who makes a slip in fact, or ventures on a department of knowledge of which he has not made himself master, is pounced upon at once and dealt with mercilessly. It is a tribute to Dr. Ballard's learning that he covers the whole ground of Christian evidences and never once lets the enemy in.

More than that, the modern apologist must carry the campaign right through the enemy's country. For it cannot be denied that the materialists have conquered and are now in practical occupation of the minds of a vast number of men and women, especially of the working and lower classes. To carry the war successfully through such a country a man needs more than learning. He needs courage, and he needs the skill to read and write popularly. He needs clear thinking. He needs vigorous and caustic expression. Dr. Ballard has all these things. Take this footnote as a short example: 'If further proof be necessary, it may be found, *passim*, in the book *Not Guilty*, by Mr. Blatchford, which has undoubtedly put the "Deterministic" theory before the minds of more people in this country than any other volume has done. One more specimen will be conclusive—"*All* praise and *all* blame are undeserved. A tramp has murdered a child on the highway, has robbed her of a few coppers and thrown her body into a ditch. Do you mean to say that that tramp could not help doing that? Do you mean to say he is not to blame? Do you mean to say he is not to be punished? Yes; I say all those things, and if all those things are not true, this book is not worth the paper it is printed on" (p. 203). Unless the tramp be insane, the book is rightly estimated.'

The Rev. F. Zorell, S.J., has got out the second and third parts of his *Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum* (Parisiis: P. Lethielleux). They carry the Lexicon to near the end of the letter P. Will this Lexicon be translated? It would stand well between Hickey and Thayer.

Mr. H. Sutton Smith of the Baptist Missionary Society has written an account of the Protestant Mission at Stanley Falls, Upper Congo. He has given the book the title of *Yakusu, the very Heart of Africa* (Marshall Brothers; 6s. net). The people who are described in the book are the Lokele, and they are described in much detail. Now just as one savage looks like another to the newly arrived white man, so one tribe is very much like another tribe to those who are not thoroughly well acquainted with mission literature. But this tribe will live in the recollection of every reader of Mr. Smith's book, distinct and intimate, so close is the acquaintance that one makes with them. If Mr. Smith's purpose was to create an interest in his mission, he has certainly accomplished it.

Mr. L. S. A. Wells, M.A., who is working with Dr. Charles on the Oxford Apocrypha, has thrown off some by-product of his severe studies in five chapters intended to elucidate the thoughts of the Hebrews throughout the great silence from Malachi to Matthew. His chapters are: (1) The Peculiar People, 440–320 B.C.; (2) The Great Beast, 320–170 B.C.; (3) The Little Horn and the Kingdom of the Saints of the Most High, 168–63 B.C.; (4) The Day of the Lord, 63 B.C.–29 A.D.; and (5) The Great Refusal and the New Election, 29–132 A.D. The title of the book is *The Choice of the Jews: A Tragedy and a Lesson* (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Andrew Murray has written a Commentary on the Reports of the Conference on Missions held in Edinburgh in 1910. His argument is that the Church is not responding to our Lord's demand for the conversion of the world.

And the reason of its failure he finds in the absence of persistent prayer. The title of his book is therefore *The State of the Church*; and its sub-title is 'A Plea for more Prayer' (Nisbet; 2s. 6d.). The book is printed after the style of Mr. Murray's Commentary on the Hebrews, the emphatic words being given in clarendon type throughout the page. This is useful to catch the eye of the busy reviewer, but it has a way of interrupting the steady reader. Nevertheless the book should be read right through. It gathers momentum as it goes.

Dr. Oesterley and Mr. Box must be congratulated on the call for a second edition of their great work on *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons). They themselves rejoice. But chiefly, like true scholars, because they are thus offered the chance of making the book better than before. They have made it better. They have read the reviews of it (and some very searching reviews there were, such as that which appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly*); they have read the new literature; and they have considered and consulted much on the subjects of most controversy. Accordingly the new edition is described as revised and corrected throughout. A certain amount of new matter has been added. The sections dealing with the Pharisees and Reform Judaism have been entirely rewritten, and a new section on Zionism has been inserted. Besides all this, the section on the Dispersion has been much enlarged, and additional notes have been written dealing with the works of Philo and the Rabbinical Seminaries. Last of all, and not least of the improvements, the price is reduced to 7s. 6d. net.

The Rev. W. B. Norris, M.A., Rector of Warblington, has discovered *A Key to Life's Mystery*, and has been bold enough to make it public in a volume of six hundred pages. The key is really quite simple. Man is a creature of two moods, a good mood and a bad. And the key is: Encourage the good mood that is in you and discourage the bad. And in order that you may encourage the good mood and discourage the bad, Mr. Norris quotes for your use passages of prose and of poetry from a vast number of writers beginning with Homer and ending with Henry Drummond. Sometimes he quotes single sentences, sometimes whole scenes. Here you snatch an apothegm from Epictetus, there you work your way through a long chapter of John Inglesant.

And it has all been very acceptable. For this is the third edition of the book, rewritten and greatly enlarged (Simpkin; 7s. 6d. net).

Dr. J. Sparhawk Jones is an original preacher. You will find his style occasionally in England, but this steady, quiet, argumentative discourse is most unusual in America. A sentence may fill from twelve to twenty lines, a paragraph may cover three pages. And the expression is so appropriate and the thought so rich that the reader (we say nothing of the hearer) passes from one sermon into another as if unable to find enough of it. There is a certain orthodoxy in the volume—not orthodoxy that is cramping, but that is steadying—which gives the reader a sense of permanent worth. The title of the book is *Saved by Hope* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press; $1).

The Gift of Healing in the Church.

By the Rev. W. F. Cobb, D.D., Rector of St. Ethelburga's, London.

Our earliest witness for the presence of the gift of healing in the Church is St. Paul. According to him, (1) the gift of healing was practised (1 Co 12); (2) it proceeded from the Spirit (v.[9b]); (3) it was one of many extraordinary gifts (v.[2]); (4) it was not conferred on all (v.[30]); (5) it was one of the greater gifts, and as such was to be sought for (v.[31]); (6) like the other gifts its primary object was the common good (v.[7]); and (7) the high road to its attainment was the way of Love (v.[31]).

We are given also in the New Testament some typical stories of the exercise of this gift. Peter and John healed a lame man at the temple-door in the name of Jesus Christ (Ac 3[6]). Peter cured the paralyzed Æneas (Ac 9[34]), and raised Tabitha from the dead (v.[40]). Philip also healed many lamed

and paralyzed folk in Samaria, and exorcised many evil spirits (8^{7}). This was indeed a common occurrence in Jerusalem according to Ac 5^{16}. Paul too healed a cripple at Lystra (14^{10}), and healed and exorcised in Ephesus (19^{12}).

These stories are related with an air of modesty and sense of proportion, and yet at the same time they seem almost inevitable in the circumstances. So wonderful was the new life that it was but natural it should have consequences out of the common even on the material plane. But there were limits to the gift. Raising from the dead was not impossible, but it was rare. Tabitha and Eutychus are the only cases, and the latter is probably not a case at all.

But though healing and exorcism were naturalized in the Apostolic Church, we feel that they are less at home than in the Gospel story. If the saying about doing greater works referred to so-called miracles, then the Apostles did not actualize it (Jn 14^{12}), for the Lord's signs were greater than theirs. Yet the two groups have a family likeness. The most characteristic works of the Lord as of His disciples were prophecy, healing and exorcism, and in all three cases they were the final consequence of the spiritual life which was being opened up.

When we pass from the Apostolic to the Isapostolic Age the mist thickens. Those who speak have less to say, and they speak in a subdued tone. They speak sometimes from hearsay only, as, for example, do Irenæus (*Adv. Hær.*, ii. 32–34) and Eusebius (*H.E.*, iii. 39) of the power of raising from the dead. On the other hand, Irenæus in the same passage says that 'some do certainly and truly drive out devils, so that those who have thus been cleansed from evil spirits frequently believe, and join themselves to the Church. Others have foreknowledge of things to come; they see visions and utter prophetic expressions. Others, again, heal the sick by laying their hands upon them, and they are made whole.' He adds that these gifts of exorcism, clairvoyance, and healing are given not through incantations, but through calling on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Justin Martyr tells the same tale in his second *Apology* addressed to the Roman Senate. 'Numberless demoniacs,' he says, 'throughout the whole world and in your city have many of our Christian men healed and are healing many, driving the devils out of the men, though they could not be cured by all the other exorcists, or by those who use incantations and drugs' (§ 6; cf. also *Apol.*, § 30).

Again, arguing with Trypho, a Jew, he affirms that heathen when they became Christians received gifts, each as he was worthy. 'For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of strength, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of God,' where healing and teaching take the place in the sevenfold gifts of wisdom and godliness (§ 39; cf. § 76).

Tertullian, too, is express as to the existence in his days of one branch of healing, namely, the casting out of evil spirits, and speaks of it as a fact admitted by the heathen themselves (*Apol.*, § 23, 37, 43; *de Idol.*, 11). In his Montanist days, however, he demands from his Catholic opponent apostolic and prophetic evidence that he had the power of forgiving sin, that is, he bids him raise the dead, or cure the feeble, as the Apostles did. He adds that a *pneumatic* Church alone has the power of forgiving sin, and (by implication) of healing the sick (*De Pud.*, c. 21). He speaks, however, as if this power of healing was not practised within his personal observation.

By the beginning of the third century, the gifts of healing, exorcism, and prophecy have lost the lusty vigour of their youth. Origen can speak only of them as leaving their 'traces among those who regulated their lives by the precepts of the gospel' (*Contra Celsum*, i. 2). In another passage, however, he tells us that the followers of Æsculapius maintained that they frequently saw their god healing and doing good and foretelling the future, while they called those people 'silly' who acknowledged the existence of Jesus and testified that He had given them a marvellous power to cure by the invocation of His name. Origen adds that 'we too have seen many persons freed from grievous calamities and from "ecstasies," and madness and countless other ills which could be cured neither by men nor devils' (*ibid.*, iii. 24).

The results of this brief inquiry into the subject of healing in the primitive Church are definite as far as they go, and may be summed up thus:—

(1) The charismatic ministry of healing was most abundantly evinced in the Person of Jesus Christ, and was joined in Him with many other gifts not found in His disciples.

(2) The further we travel from His period on

earth, the less strong and less frequent do the gifts of the Spirit show themselves.

(3) The most persistent of them are the gifts of healing, exorcism, and prophecy.

(4) As they die away, the greater is the emphasis laid on the moral superiority of Christians over heathens.

(5) The decay of the gifts moves *pari passu* with the naturalizing (or secularizing) of the Church.

(6) The charismatic ministry of healing was bestowed on lines other than official. The priest did not possess the gift as a priest, nor was it withheld from the layman because he was a layman.

There is no need to discuss in detail the manifestations of the gift of healing in the later Church, nor would it be easy. For the difficulty of the discussion is like the difficulty attending an inquiry into modern spiritualism. It is not the want of material for a judgment which causes now our perplexity. It is its abundance, and its inequality. Ecclesiastical 'miracles' of healing are there by the thousand, but it is a minority of them alone which stand the test of cross-examination. But there is enough to warrant the statement that what had now come to be called 'miraculous' healings were of not infrequent occurrence. Every man or woman of saintly character was expected to work miracles, and, therefore, it was natural that he should. Some would call miracles endemic in the mediæval Church. Perhaps they were. Perhaps the universal belief in their possibility afforded the conditions necessary for their becoming actual.

Hence we shall not be quick to reject the story of St. Augustine of Canterbury healing at Eboracum a man who was at once blind and paralyzed (Newman, *Lives of the English Saints*, iii. p. 381). It will sound to us quite natural that St. Walburga should have been sent by an inner impulse to the death-bed of the daughter of a neighbouring baron, and by her prayers continued through the night at the bedside should have brought the maiden back to life (*ibid.*, ii. 105).

St. Germanus is another example of healing power attending on sanctity. The sick came to him at Ravenna from all sides, and were healed. He brought back from apparent death the son of a court official, and cast the devil from another young man afflicted with 'falling sickness' (*ibid.*, ii. 418).

Similar cases of healing are found throughout Church history. It would be the very height of unreason to dismiss them all as due to fraud, or credulity, or party-spirit. Whatever the proportion of non-fact to fact among them may be, there is truth in Pascal's remark that 'the existence of the false necessarily points to the existence of the true as their antecedent cause' (*Pensées*, ii. 235), even as the similarity of the stories about ghosts witnesses to their having a true cause behind them.

We are justified, therefore, in concluding that the gift of healing, which flourished in the early Church and then decayed, reappeared in later times amid much that was false, and though now labelled as miraculous bore witness to the fact that the same Power which healed in earlier days had never ceased His healing activity, but manifested it wherever He found a person fitted to be His instrument.

Some light may be thrown, perhaps, on the nature of the power of healing by a consideration of the numerous cases in which this power has been exercised through relics or other sacred objects. The belief that cures have been worked by means of relics, or at the tombs or shrines of saints, or by the use of some object associated with a saint, is found in every age of the Church; indeed, the relics of the saints seem to have been more efficacious than their living bodies. Moreover, as sanctity is unprovable, except so far as it finds expression in supernormal effects, the demand of the Roman Church authorities that proof of 'miracles' shall precede canonization is entirely reasonable. It is true that grave warnings are given against building on visions, voices, powers, and supernormal happenings, but this is only because experience has shown how narrow is the boundary line between delusion and the transcendental order of being next above us. But this caution does not contradict, it rather implies, belief in the possibility of the supernormal. Indeed, the belief of the Church has always been that if 'miracles' did not happen, it would be a miracle that they did not.

Examples of the cures in question are numerous. There are, for example, the apparently unquestionable cures effected at the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury immediately after his death. Take the witness of John of Salisbury. 'There,' he says, speaking of the shrine, 'great miracles are wrought. . . . For in the place of his passion, and in the place where he lay before the great altar previous to burial, and in the place where he was at last

buried, paralytics are cured, the blind see, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, the lame walk, lepers are cured . . . and (a thing unheard of from the days of our fathers) the dead are raised' (E. A. Abbott, *St. Thomas of Canterbury*, i. 227).

Benedict, a Canterbury monk and familiar with the archbishop, also tells us that on the third day after the martyrdom the news of it reached the wife of a Sussex knight, suffering from weakness and blindness. She then vowed herself to the saint, and immediately she began to recover, and on the sixth day she rose from her bed. The good monk winds up his account of this miracle with the pious remark: 'This beginning of signs did Jesus in Sussex of England, and manifested the glory of his martyr before the faces of his disciples who ate and drank with him before he was slain' (*Ibid., loc. cit.*). If Benedict may transplant a second century remark for the benefit of the twelfth century, what is to hinder our doing the same for the twentieth?

We may take one other illustration of the use of material objects in the working of cures, in the famous case of Marguerite Périer, a boarder at Port Royal in 1656. She had been suffering there for eighteen months at the age of ten from a lachrymal fistula; the bone of the nose was diagnosed as carious, and purulent matter found its way thence into the throat. It happened, however, that an ecclesiastic who lived close by was in possession of an authentic spike from the Saviour's crown of thorns. He lent it to the nuns. They naturally paid due homage to the sacred relic, and an *exposition* took place in the Church. When Marguerite approached, one of the sisters, Sœur Flavie, noticing her swollen face, applied to it the holy thorn. That day the cure was complete. Three weeks afterwards, five physicians and two surgeons signed and published a certificate, stating their belief that such a cure 'was beyond the ordinary power of nature, and could not have taken place without a miracle.' 'Finally, in 1728, when Port Royal had been destroyed, and the very bones of its saints cast out of their graves, Pope Benedict XIII. quotes in his printed works, the case of Marguerite Périer as a proof that in the true Church the age of miracles had not gone by' (see R. H. Hutton, *Essays Theological and Literary*, 2nd ed. vol. i. pp. 33–35).

We have here, then, two cases out of thousands sufficiently convincing that inanimate objects so called do actually assist in the curing of disease, whatever the explanation may be. Probably we shall find that it will help us materially to understand something of the true nature of the charismatic ministry of healing as exercised by persons in the flesh.

The fact being now beyond question that charismatic healing meets us in the lives of Christ and His Apostles, in the Early Church, and indeed in every age of the Christian Church, there now remains only to inquire into its nature and the method of its working.

In the first place, it seems to demand a certain receptiveness on the part of those who are its patients. In His own country Jesus could do no mighty work because of its unbelief (Mk $6^{5.6}$). On the other hand, He declared repeatedly that it was the faith of His patients which had made them whole. He insisted that all things are possible to him that has faith (Mk 9^{23}). He asks of the impotent man whether he had the will to become well (Jn 5^{6}).

In accordance with these statements is the observation that an atmosphere of faith in a Church, people, or age is one in which the gift of healing is most likely to occur and to succeed.

A similar phenomenon is observable in other departments of life. A genius demands for his usefulness, and indeed for his appearance at all, a circle of appreciative friends who may at once stimulate, support, and concentrate his efforts. Witches flourished so long as witchcraft was believed in, and withered away in the chilling air of a rationalistic age. Great leaders of men rarely appear in democracies; they come to peoples who are willing to be led. They have no work to do where everybody is his own leader. Prophets rise when there is a hunger for the words of God, and poets are dumb when there is no ear that cares for their music.

So it is with the gift of healing. It can flourish only, like all living things, in a congenial soil. Why a rationalistic age is unable to supply that soil is not because it is pushing the claims of Reason, but because it is arrogant, that is, self-sufficient, that is, non-receptive. Before Faith can dwell in the soul, the soul must be emptied of its pride. For the faith through which cures are effected is more than assent to what is credible, more than belief, more than obedience to authority, more than passive receptiveness. It

is an active force. It is the life of God in the soul, and where that life is active there is purity, power, and health.

It should not, however, be hastily assumed that this indwelling faith can be called into activity only by affirmation of personal mind. To repeat continually: 'I am Love; I am Health; I am Righteousness; I am Abundance; I am Wisdom; I am Healing Power; I am Achievement because I am one with God,' is a form of auto-suggestion which does not necessarily do more than dispose the heart for the unspeakable gift of God. It may be true to say that 'disease, weakness, marks of old age, are only the resultant effects of thought'; that 'worry, folly, poverty, lust, decrepitude are simply the reflections of mind,' and yet that such an affirmation may be but a half-truth, for health, strength, peacefulness, wisdom, wealth, purity and vitality are the results of something besides thinking. They are such results, and they are not. They are, so far as right thinking has provided, the conditions under which such blessings as health and strength have been made possible. They are not, so far as it is a power not ourselves which performs the good work in us.

It seems necessary just now to insist on the importance of this distinction in view of the chronic inability of the average man to maintain the law of balance of allied opposites. He is apt to forget either the Transcendence of God or His Immanence. For some centuries he has neglected the latter. He is tempted to-day to ignore the former. Yet both truths are necessary both to sane thinking and to healthy living. That living thing we call Faith is the God indwelling in us. But the experience of ages is express. It says plainly that the indwelling power calls for the transcendent power to awake it, and that that transcendent power is something greater and deeper than any affirmation made by the personal self. God works not only *within* us, but also *upon* us. The Divine more often slumbers within, waiting quietly for the hour when the lower self shall have been sufficiently purified and braced as to be able to respond to the impulse directed upon it from without. It may be the shock of a great joy or a great sorrow, a great loss or a great gain, but it is not the shock itself which arouses the sleeping Deity within. It is the Transcendent God using the shock for the purpose of piercing through the veil of habit, sloth, and ignorance which shut off all approach to the Holy of Holies within.

The Place of the Healer.

It is here that the Spiritual Healer has his place. He is not himself the Healer, but only the organ, or the agent, of the Great Healer. He is the channel through which the power of God flows to the person who needs it. What is more, his agency is a necessary factor in the work of healing, in virtue of what appears to be a cosmic law. For the Divine force in the universe remains latent until such time as it is focussed in some form through which it may work. This law holds good of God's healing power as of all His powers. Hence, though He is always ready and waiting to heal, He does not actually heal until an entrance is found for Him into the world of suffering through some finite agency. The province of the Spiritual Healer is to provide such an agency.

Thus in the act of healing two things are required. It has its active and its passive side, as all things have. The passive side is supplied by the faith of the sick person, which in its turn is closely bound up with the general faith of the community. When healing is in the air, more people are prepared and are fit to be healed.

The active side is supplied by the Divine life focussed in an individual who somehow is fitted to be its channel.

There is no *a priori* ground for limiting the channel of healing to an individual spirit still in the flesh. We have seen that all ages of the Church witness to the healing work of Christ in His Church militant. But they witness no less clearly to the fact that excarnate spirits take their part also. This seems to be the truth underlying all genuine instances of healing by means of relics. For neither of the two other explanations given seem to be adequate. One of these ascribes the cure to 'faith-healing.' But, as we have seen above, the faith of the sick man is but one of the two co-operant factors concerned. The second explanation refers, with Dr. Newman, to the power conferred on those material atoms which have formed part of the body of a saint. They have acquired something of the nature of Spirit itself. In this case, however, it is not the bone which works the cure, but the higher potency which has attached itself to the bone. But if

this be so, it is far simpler to say that the healing efficacy of the saint's spirit resides not so much in his discarded physical skeleton, as in his present higher body. In other words, where cures are effected by means of relics, or at such centres as Lourdes, or at one of the many holy wells, the most natural explanation is that which sees there the working of some excarnate spirit, angel, or other being who finds in the faith of the sufferer a suitable response.

It should be added that there seems no necessity for assuming that in all cases the name of the active healing spirit is that which we on this side give it. Whether the voices of Jeanne D'Arc's guides came from those known on earth by the names of Margaret and Catherine, or from some other beings, makes little difference. They were, anyhow, genuine spirit-voices, and they enabled Jeanne to do what they sent her to do. Similarly, we may assign cures to our Lady of Walsingham, or of Lourdes, or to St. Patrick, or St. James of Compostella, or to the Holy Coat, or a piece of the Cross, or to some relic, but all that we can be sure of is that *some* agent of the Christ is at work, and we shall give the glory to God, acknowledging that His power is not estopped by our mistake, if mistake there be.

Charismatic Healing and Sanctity.

We may ask next how far the power of charismatic healing depends on the sanctity of the healer. The question is somehow confused by the fact that sanctity is not of a uniform type. In the case of the Christ, as in that of the Buddha, the history says clearly that He was not an ascetic. Nor were His immediate disciples. On the other hand, mediæval sanctity was inseparable from asceticism. Yet in all three cases cures were performed. Perhaps the explanation lies in the fact that what is essential to sanctity is not so much asceticism as self-surrender to God, and that this very self-surrender is the necessary precondition of all the work of a spiritual healer. For it is God which worketh in him both to will and to do. He is always the Healer, and is always ready to heal. But where the will is set towards the separated self, His power cannot get through. Where, on the contrary, the will is set on Him as the Universal Self,—where, in other words, sanctity is,—there He can and does heal through His saint.

Closely allied with the truth that sanctity, as above defined, is a condition to be fulfilled on the part of the healer, is the further truth that in some degree it is also required of the patient. We say 'in some degree,' because God blesses from the beginning, and does not wait for the end. Yet we ought to be on our guard against the temptation to divorce sickness from its cause. Its cause is in every case to be found in a wrong state of the will somewhere—if not in the sufferer, then in his ancestors, or relations, or friends, or others. He may be suffering from his own misdeeds, and while he clings to them he cannot be healed, nor should we expect or wish him to be healed. He may have begun to see the truth through his sufferings, and in that case he has begun to be ready for healing. He may have come to love the truth now made clear by suffering, and if so, he is now ripe for healing. He may, again, be suffering vicariously as a redeemer, and in that case there is no healing to be done, for release will come only when redemption is complete.

The Charisma general or particular?

One final question remains, and that is, whether the gift of healing is to be regarded as the prerogative of a few, or whether it is to be looked for generally in the Church. St. Paul certainly implies that it was given to some only, when he asks: 'Have all gifts of healings?' We should, however, bear in mind that he has in view open and unmistakable manifestations of the working of the Spirit, that is, such workings as were so intense as to stand out as exceptional. He does not consider the case where all have some healing power, though the degree of it may be low, or where it is overshadowed by more striking gifts, as, *e.g.*, where a low degree of healing power is united with the gift of tongues to an eminent and remarkable extent.

The true answer to our question would seem to be that wherever there is Faith at all there is proportionate healing power, even though its possessor is unaware of its existence. For where faith is, God is; and where God is, there is healing power. But the possession of faith, in its more elementary stages, does not entitle a man to the special charisma of healing. This is a gift, and like all God's gifts is not given according to rule, or rather man's rule, for God follows the rule of the counsel of His own will. If we were to adopt a familiar phraseology and say that the gifts of

God descend in a sevenfold stream of light, and that the ruler, the healer, the man of action, the priest, the philosopher, the poet, and the initiate represent the several rays, then, varying St. Paul, we might say that to one it is given to be a healer, another a priest, another a poet, and so on. So that the gift of healing bears an exceptional character.

Yet, exceptional as it may seem to be, it is not to be regarded as lawless. Law, that is, Wisdom and Justice, runs through all things. We may be sure, therefore, that Wisdom and Justice lie behind the gift of healing, if only we had eyes to track them. There must be some answer somewhere to the question: 'Why has one man received the gift of healing, and not another?' Or, as the question should be put: 'Why has this particular man this particular gift? Has he done anything that I have not done, to win it or earn it?' Here we may guess, but we cannot know. Yet a guess may do good.

If for convenience we accept the sevenfold division of gifts just referred to, we may say that all the seven modes of activity are alike necessary and valuable, but that the individual's own choice determines which shall be allotted to him. It may be that in the earlier stages of his eternal career some seemingly small exercises of his own free-will sent him off to this or that path of development; and that then he took his place for the æon on the path corresponding to his choice. We who see what comes out only say that he has the gift of healing, or of thinking, or of inspiring, or ruling, or acting, or what not. But He who sees the whole inner history of the man knows that he is where he is, and is gifted as he is, in obedience to a law, which is but Wisdom and Justice at work.

To conclude: Healing is a gift; it is given according to Law; it is to be exercised under Law; it may show itself as vital, magnetic, mental, or spiritual, but it is God's very power working in these different forms which is that which heals. He Himself makes the agent; it is He who supplies him with power. It is He too who brings together healer and patient, and creates the spark of health from their contact. To Him, therefore, be all the glory.

Contributions and Comments.

A Protest against that Chaotic Monstrosity 'Comparative Religion.'

Ten years ago I was a member of the Theological Board of Studies of the newly constituted teaching University of London. We were engaged in the delicate task of framing the course of theological discipline for the degrees in Divinity, and in that work we attained satisfactory results. We were about twenty in number, and included representatives of the Anglican Church, Wesleyan Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists. While the atmosphere without was rent with storms over the elementary education in religious knowledge of children under fourteen, we calmly deliberated without the slightest suspicion or mistrust, and solved all our problems respecting the theological instruction of our respective students for the Christian ministry.

We fortunately had a very able chairman, Principal Robertson of King's College, now Bishop of Exeter. Among the subjects for the final B.D. examination it was agreed that an optional department should be admitted, mainly for the benefit of our missionary students, namely, that which is endowed with the evil name 'Comparative Religion.' The absurdity of the title was duly pointed out. Religion, it was argued, is not a science, but a concrete living reality. We can speak of a comparative science because a science is founded on observation and comparison and the resulting classification of phenomena and the determination of their relations. We can therefore talk of comparative grammar or comparative physiology, anatomy, or morphology, because in each case we are dealing with the collection and grouping of observed facts and the determination of their inter-relations. Comparative grammar of the Semitic languages involves merely an extension of the same processes that are applied to a single language such as Aramaic or Arabic. But one need not be a follower of Ritschl, who exposed

the vice of confusing knowledge with religion, to see in a moment the absurdity of such an expression as 'Comparative Religion.' As well talk of comparative tree, comparative dog, or comparative language. Under the wise guidance of the Bishop of Exeter, we ultimately landed in the safe designation: *Comparative Study of Religion.*

But old abuses die hard, and the old unintelligible term still passes current. The mischief extends further than is usually supposed. There are some well-meaning people who imagine that some kind of universal jumble of religion—Mohammedan, Christian, Buddhistic — may furnish a quasi world-religious Esperanto which is to take the place of the old historic religions. We are to be satisfied with a compound photograph. Putting these idle fancies aside, I would suggest that readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES should ask themselves whether this monstrosity 'Comparative Religion' should not be finally extinguished. Unfortunately we are hardly accustomed to use 'science' as the Germans employ 'Wissenschaft.' Our physicists have almost monopolized it. I much wish that our British and American theologians would more resolutely claim their rights. *Vergleichende Religionswissenschaft* is perhaps less strange to German ears than 'Comparative Science of Religion' is to our own. 'Comparative Theology' would be misleading, because hardly adequate. We have no recognized Greek word for 'religion' on which to attach our *-logy.* This would dispel our difficulties. Meanwhile I would propound the modest yet adequate formula suggested by the Bishop of Exeter. And if henceforth any one is tempted to lapse into 'Comparative Religion,' may the Socratic *daimōn* visit him with remorseful twinge and whisper ὦ ᾽γαθέ, ἄτοπόν τι λέγεις· εὐφήμει.

OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE.

Cambridge.

The Belief in the Miraculous in New Testament Times.

PRINCIPAL GARVIE, in his excellent paper entitled 'The Living Christ and the Historical Jesus' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for June, criticises Harnack's view of miracles (p. 404). We miss in the article any reference to the book of Harnack's quoted, but the argument and the language suggest *Das Wesen des Christentums* The German professor is held to assert that miracles were in our Lord's day 'almost something commonplace' ('fast etwas Alltägliches' in *Das Wesen*, 1906, p. 16). To this apparently Professor Garvie objects. 'In ascribing miracles to Jesus, the evangelists knew that they were affirming something exceptional of Him.' With this statement of the article we are not in the least disposed to quarrel. Were there any doubt of its truth after a reading of the Synoptics, all such doubt would disappear after a study of the earliest speeches of the apostles as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, where the apologetic is on the basis of the works of Jesus. But that the statements of the two professors are contradictory or at variance we are not prepared to admit. The question at issue is one which has scarcely received the attention it deserves. It is that of the place of the miraculous in the popular thought of our Lord's day. Harnack really maintains that the popular mind was accustomed to and expectant of miracles when Jesus came. A predisposition to believe in them was in the mental make-up of the time. Professor Garvie's position, on the other hand, seems to imply that anything of a miraculous nature was to the people an entirely new and unexpected phenomenon introduced by our Lord.

Now it cannot be denied that there is evidence in the New Testament to support the German savant's view. 'The Jews require a sign.' They were a people expecting in any religious teacher signs confirming His claims. What was a sign to them? Any one reading the account of the incident where Pharisees came to Jesus demanding a sign, will come to the conclusion that they required something exceptional, something extraordinary. But were there not signs enough? Were there not all the miracles of healing that Jesus had already performed? Obviously the Pharisees demanded something more than these. These were not convincing enough. The incident clearly suggests that some at least of our Lord's miracles were not then regarded as so extraordinary, as they have been held by later Christians. Can it be that these were not 'exceptional of Him'? Can it be that He was only one miracle-worker among others? One word of Christ has been preserved which casts a flood of light on a page that would otherwise be very dark. After the healing of the man blind and dumb, the Pharisees accused Jesus

of casting out devils by the aid of Beelzebub. Our Lord's reply was a counter-charge. 'And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? Therefore shall they be your judges' (Mt 12^{27} = Lk 11^{19}). Obviously our Lord was not alone in working miracles. Some miracles at least—on the admission of Jesus Himself—were performed by the adherents of the various religious schools. If Harnack somewhat exaggerates when he declares that miracles were 'fast etwas alltägliches,' clearly we cannot go so far on the other side and regard all miracles as exceptional of Jesus. The account of the same incident, however, lets it be clearly seen that the work was regarded by the people as something extraordinary. 'And all the multitudes were amazed,' and it was the amazement apparently that gave rise to the whole conversation. However, it is not impossible psychologically to harmonize this with the fact that many in that day claimed and exhibited this power of healing. Such an instantaneous cure would naturally be regarded as miraculous and call forth expressions of astonishment. Men would marvel at the cure, then as now, even if it occurred six times every day. The miraculous would still appear miraculous, no matter how many people performed it. And it would still go by the name of 'sign,' 'wonder,' 'power,' even though our Lord was one amongst many.

The evidence, we conclude, justifies us in the view that a belief in the miraculous was not a new element arising from the work of Jesus, but was part of the outlook of the day. Our Lord's miracles were rather an accommodation to prevalent opinion.

Such a view brings not a little help to the understanding of some of the incidents recorded in the New Testament. It has always been a difficulty to account for the faith—at times, stupendous, of those who came to Jesus and sought His wonderful power. Various suggestions have at different times been made, the commonest being that the fame of Jesus being noised abroad gave the sick encouragement to look for a cure. But that by itself scarcely seems enough. How, for instance, shall we account for the confidence of a woman, who, after suffering twelve years with an incurable disease, and having spent all on physicians, believes that by merely touching the hem of Christ's garment she will be made whole? To have heard of Christ's cures was something, but more is required to explain such an astounding confidence. However, if we can assume that in her mental attitude there was grounded a firm belief in such miraculous cures, if there was in her mind a predisposition to believe in such, that, added to what she had heard of Christ, seems sufficient to explain her attitude. The very fact that physicians had failed, would make her more disposed to rely on the miraculous. It would be her last hope—and such a hope dies hard. If there were other miracle-workers in Palestine, had she tried them? It is not unlikely. But even then the reports of Christ would revive all the old hope of such a healing, and make her feel that at last the man had come who could do this thing. In her case and in that of many another, the fact of the astonishing faith is simplified by the assumption of a widespread popular belief in miraculous cures. Such a belief there would be if, as we have seen, others besides our Lord and before Him had claimed the power of healing the sick. It would seem that Harnack is correct when he asserts that in our Lord's day 'man fühlte und sah sich von Wundern umgeben' (p. 16).

However, if this is correct, how are we to explain the undoubted fact that 'in ascribing miracles to Jesus the evangelists knew that they were affirming something exceptional of Him,' and that the first appeal by the disciples to the Jews to believe on Him was on the basis of these very works? This would seem to be accounted for by the fact that, although there were other miracle-workers, our Lord was without compeer in this as in other realms. So far as the evidence goes, others wrought only miracles of healing. Our Lord wrought others besides. There were the nature miracles, and the raising of the dead. These, so far as we can judge, were characteristic of the Lord alone. Whether it was miracles of this class, which exhibited supremely His control of the laws of nature, or whether it was the *nature* of His miracles of healing which raised Him in the eyes of the people head and shoulders above all other workers in the same field, it is impossible to determine. Certain it is, that while miracles were not 'exceptional of Him,' *His* miracles were. That the people recognized, as is made clear in all the narratives, and that, too, the disciples saw, as is obvious from the opening chapters of the Acts. In conclusion, it may be noticed that in Acts the miracles are only used to show 'that God was

with him' ($2^{22.23}$ 10^{38}). The fact that His miracles were remarkable *among miracles* shows that God was with Him in a remarkable degree. And further, *the* great miracle in the early apologetic was His own Resurrection (Ac $2^{24.31.36}$ 3^{15} 5^{30} 10^{40}). That is for the apostles the great proof of His divinity. And in that the Lord stood alone. No wonder-worker, not even the 'sons of the Pharisees,' had equalled Him there.

ARTHUR DAKIN.

Manchester.

2 Cor. xii. 9 in the Revised Version.

THE answer to Professor Nestle's inquiry is rather an old story. In 1899 the late Bishop Westcott 'called the attention of the Syndics of the Press to this reading ("strength"), and pointed out that he believed it would be a mistake. The original notes made during the revision were referred to, and from these it clearly appeared that the revisers intended the word "power" to be substituted for the word "strength," but that this change had not been carried out; it was therefore agreed by the two Presses that the correction should be made, so as to give effect to what was shown from the documents to be the intention of the revisers.' This quotation is from a communication from the Cambridge University Press printed in *The Guardian* in December 1907. C. S. WARD.

Walsham Priory, Suffolk.

A Note on 'Power on the Head.'

AN old interpretation of the obscure phrase ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς (1 Co 11^{10}), which has gained some favour in modern times, is that ἐξουσία means a talisman or phylactery to ward off the intrusion of spirits, who were supposed to have intercourse with women through their mouths or ears. This idea maintained itself very late: in a mediæval hymn to the Virgin (Lincoln MSS. Ff. i. 6. 42), I find:

> Gaude virgo mater Christi,
> Quae *per aurem* concepisti.

But the objection to this interpretation is twofold: διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους must mean *on account of* (not *against*) the *angels* (not evil spirits): for there can have been no danger to women from good angels during a sacred service. Is not the following a more likely view? Women were under the guardianship of angels, who were their spiritual lovers, and were jealous of their human attachments. (Compare the story of Cecilia, well known from Chaucer's version in the 'Second Nun's Tale.') During a service these angels would be specially jealous of their protegées' human husbands, towards whom the women might be inclined to cast glances. To prevent such danger, the women were to wear talismans over the head. Yet, Paul adds, this does not involve a complete severance between men and women ἐν κυρίῳ, in the Christian life: at proper times intercourse is allowable. Such an interpretation gives a natural meaning to ἐξουσία (cp. ἐξουσιάζει, 1 Co 7^4), to διά, and to ἄγγελοι: it maintains the parallelism with διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα ($11.^9$), and suits the context.

E. E. KELLETT.

Cambridge.

What kind of Food was it that Tamar made for Amnon? (2 Sam. xiii. 5–8).

THE Hebrew words used in the narrative appear to give definite answers to the following questions:—

(1) WHAT SHAPE? ANSWER, *heart*-shaped, לְבִבוֹת.

(2) OF WHAT SUBSTANCE? ANSWER, made of *dough*, בָּצֵק, *i.e.* that which *swells*.

(3) HOW MADE? ANSWER, kneaded, וַתָּלָשׁ.

(4) HOW COOKED? ANSWER, boiled, וַתְּבַשֵּׁל.

These Hebrews words, taken in their ordinary senses, dispose effectually of any such interpretations as *pancakes*, which are neither made of dough, nor kneaded, nor boiled; indeed, they dispose of any kind of *cakes*. But with equal clearness they point to what are called *hasty puddings* or *dough dumplings*, made of the dough of which bread is baked. The maker takes a small lump, twists or pats it into a globular shape and drops it into a pan of boiling water. It swells in cooking, and is very soon ready for eating. Its shape and size might very easily give it the name, *heart*.

We might improve our translation by substituting *dumplings* for 'cakes' and *boiled* for 'baked.'

H. HIGHFIELD.

Wesley College, Colombo.

The Interpretation of 2 Sam. viii. 2.

'He measured two lines to put to death, and one full line to keep alive.'

As ordinarily understood, that is, that David slew, roughly speaking, two-thirds of his Moabite captives, one may remark on the considerable length of line, that is to say, *cord*, required, and the awkwardness as well as barbarity of the proceeding.

Another interpretation long ago suggested itself to me. Can this not be a kind of parallel to the story in Roman history of Tarquin and the chiefs of Gabii? David made his Moabite captives lie down one by one and measured them; those for whom one line was enough he allowed to escape death, but the taller ones, those who exceeded the one line's *full* length, and so who required two lines, he slew.

H. Highfield.

Wesley College, Colombo.

James iii. 5. . . . A Personal Reminiscence?

'Behold, how much wood is kindled by how small a fire!'

The writer, whom many good scholars will regard as James and a brother of Jesus, like Jesus, was fond of teaching by pictures which develop rather into similes than parables. We are inclined to press his relationship to Jesus, but apt to forget that this entails a relationship to Joseph the Carpenter. May not this picturesque exclamation remind us a little of the latter? Behind or beside the carpenter's home was the woodyard with its logs and planks and shavings. There may even be in these graphic words the remembrance of some special incident of danger. Suppose, for example, that one of the sons had gone in search of a forgotten tool after dark with a light, but was called back by the father's voice uttering a warning almost in the words now commented on.

H. Highfield.

Wesley College, Colombo.

ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται (2 Thess. ii. 7).

I do not propose to say anything about the interpretation of the difficult 'eschatological' passage 2 Th 2^{3-12}, but merely to call attention to one phrase in it, which seems to have been somewhat misunderstood. St. Paul is telling his Thessalonian readers that 'the man of lawlessness' will for a time be restrained in regard to his evil activities, and that his power for mischief will not be fully manifested ἕως [ὁ κατέχων] ἐκ μέσου γένηται. It is generally held that this expression implies destruction or overthrow. H. St. J. Thackeray (*The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, p. 140), adapting the usual view that the restraining force is the Roman Empire, points out that Jewish Apocalyptic writers constantly anticipate the destruction and fall of that Empire before the coming of Messiah. Among early commentators on the passage, Jerome and Chrysostom[1] agree that the words refer to the destruction of the Roman Empire. Bishop Ellicott regards the phrase as equivalent to ἕως ἐκ μέσου ἀρθῇ (1 Co 5^{2}, Is 57^{2} [LXX]; Col 2^{14}, where Lightfoot quotes the passage from 2 Thessalonians as a parallel). But are the two expressions equivalent? The one, ἐκ μέσου αἴρεσθαι, is, as Lightfoot says, a strong one. It implies an outside force, and, very often, destruction. The other, ἐκ μέσου γίγνεσθαι, like the corresponding phrase in Herodotus, iii. 83, ἐκ μέσου καθέζεσθαι, denotes voluntary action. A like distinction between somewhat similar phrases is found in Latin. When, for instance, Cicero wishes to express the idea that his client's enemies were hoping to find his murder easy, he uses the words 'perfacile hunc incautum et rusticum . . . *de medio tolli* (= ἐκ μέσου αἴρεσθαι) posse' (Cic., *pro Sex. Roscio*, vii. 20). A little later on in the same speech (xxviii. 112), where he is rhetorically requesting some one to get out of his way, he says, '*recede de medio*' (= ἐκ μέσου γενοῦ).

But we are not left to analogy. The writings of St. Paul's younger contemporary Plutarch, show clearly what is the real meaning of the rare phrase ἐκ μέσου γίγνεσθαι, which occurs in the New Testament only in the passage before us. In the *Timoleon* (v. 3), Plutarch relates how his hero, after killing his brother for political reasons, found public opinion so strong against him that he resolved to retire (for a time as it turned out) from public life, ἔγνω ζῆν καθ' ἑαυτόν, ἐκ μέσου γενόμενος The phrase is found in the same sense in *Nic. c. Crass.*, ii. 4, ἐκ μέσου γενόμενον καθῆσθαι. From

[1] His words are ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ Ῥωμαϊκὴ ὅταν ἀρθῇ ἐκμέσου, κ.τ.λ.

these passages it seems clear that St. Paul contemplates the Restrainer rather as retiring voluntarily from the scene of action than as forcibly removed or overthrown. And this may have some bearing on the question of the interpretation of the passage as a whole, which, however, I promised at the outset not to discuss.

H. W. FULFORD.

Datchworth Rectory, Herts.

The Lake of Tiberius.

BOTH the *Dictionary of the Bible* and the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* have an article on the 'Sea of Galilee'; the one under the letter G, in vol. ii. 102–104, by S. Merrill, the other under S, vol. ii. 587–594, by W. M. Christie. Both articles are worthy of the place where they stand, and of the subject with which they deal. But both need supplementing in one particular point, namely, on the name of the lake.

> Merrill writes: 'Twice John employs "Sea of Tiberias" (*θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος*).'
>
> Christie writes: 'The form "Sea of Tiberias" (*θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος* occurs in Jn 6^1 21^1). The modern designation "*Lake* of Tiberias" does not occur in the N.T. It is found for the first time as *λίμνη Τιβερίας* in Pausanias (v. 7).'

This looks all right, and similar statements are to be found everywhere; but there seems to be one letter wrong: was not the name 'Sea or Lake of Tiberi*us*'? In both passages from John we do *not* read *θάλασσα τῆς Τιβεριάδος* as quoted above, but *τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Τιβεριάδος*. In other words, *τῆς Τιβεριάδος* may be adjective and attribute joined to, not noun depending on, *τῆς θαλάσσης*. This possibility becomes probability, when we consider parallel passages. Origen (in *John*, 6. 41), *περὶ τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Τιβεριάδα λίμνην*; Eusebius (*Onomastica*, 162. 4) *ἐπὶ τὴν Τιβεριάδα λίμνην*; though 74. 14, *παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Τιβεριάδος* (but note: *without* article!). The most interesting passage is in Josephus (*Bell. Jud.*, iii. 3, 5). Here the printed text has *μέχρι τῆς πρὸς Τιβεριάδα λίμνης*; Niese conjectured *τῆς πρὸς Τιβεριάδι λίμνης*, but the MSS. VRS, and Hegesippus read *τῆς Τιβεριάδος λίμνης*, and in his Index Niese gives '*Τιβεριέων λίμνη*, *B.J.* iv. 456; *Τιβεριὰς λίμνη*, *B.* iii. 57.' In the passage of Pausanias quoted by Christie, the Teubner edition of Schubert reads, *λίμνην Τιβεριάδα καλουμένην* (neither *Τιβερίδα* as quoted by Christie, nor *Τιβεριάδος*, as quoted by Furrer (*ZntW.*, 1902, 262). But whether *Τιβερίδα* or *Τιβεριάδα* be correct, this does not mean 'Lake of Tiberi*as*,' as Christie translated; but 'Lake of Tiberius.'

Burkitt in the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* renders Jn 6^1 'Lake of Tiberi*us*,' giving 'Tiberias' as probable variant of the Sinai-Codex; Pusey-Guilliam has in both places '*mare Tiber*ii'; though I confess that the spelling of the Syriac MSS. does not entitle us to be so positive on this point. Compare the spelling of the name 'Andr*eas*' on the same page of the *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*. The question would be settled if the statement had any foundation, which I find in Zeller's *Bibellexion* (Calw, 1892, p. 339), in the article 'Herodes Antipas.' It reads:

> 'In honour of the Emperor Tiberius he built a new capital for Galilee, "Tiberias," *and*, to retain for himself the favour of the emperor, he *changed* the name of the lake into Tiberias.'

There, the capital and the lake have both the same name, and the naming is in both cases ascribed to Antipas. But I can find no source for the statement that Antipas gave this name to the lake. However, from a linguistic point of view it seems probable that 'Tiberias' means 'the town and the lake of Tiberius,' and not 'the town of Tiberius' and 'the lake of Tiberi*as*.' Note that John writes the town (6^{23}) without article; and thus Eusebius in the second passage. Josephus uses the name of the town in most cases without article, and several times with article, in some places the MSS. vary. Luther translated in Jn 21^1 at first 'meer Tiberias,' afterwards 'meer *bei* Tiberias.' In German we are accustomed to say 'der See Tiberias' (not 'of'). The parallel name *Τρῳάς* stands nine times without article, only 2 Co 2^{12} with article. The probability is therefore that the name of the lake means the lake of (the emperor) Tiberius, not of (the town) Tiberias. It would be interesting to learn what other objects besides towns and months (Cæsarea, Tiberias; July, August) were named after emperors; whether this was the case with lakes or mountains.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Unbiblical Views about Biblical Matters.

It would form an interesting publication if any one were to collect such common views about Biblical matters as are not warranted by the Bible itself. For instance, how old and how general is the view that the forbidden fruit of Paradise was an apple, though the Bible itself does not specify the tree? A mediæval verse runs: 'Māla māli *mālo* peperit māla maxima mundo.' That the Wise Men from the East were *three* in number is a general belief, though their number is not given in Matthew.

I hit recently at one time on two examples of such unwarranted views.

Both Justin Martyr and Tertullian find the number Twelve of the Apostles protypified in the O.T.; Justin the Martyr by the number of the *bells* on the hem of the coat of the High Priest (*Dial.* 42): but nowhere in the Bible is it stated that these bells were *twelve* in number; Tertullian by the twelve springs of Elim, the twelve gems on the breastplate, the twelve stones which Joshua chose from the Jordan and *deposited in the ark of Covenant*, 'duodecim lapides ab Jesu de Jordane electos *et in arcam testamenti conditos*' (*adv. Marc.* iv. 13). Nowhere do we read that these stones found a place there.

Quite different from the belief of Justin Martyr is that of Clement of Alexandria, who knows that the said bells were 360 in number, in agreement with the days of the Egyptian year. The Talmud states them to have been 72.

Even in Josephus we find such unbiblical views about Biblical matters, or in the N.T. statements which cannot be verified from the Old, that Salmon married Rahab (Mt 1), that Abraham was called *before* he came to Haran (Ac 7), that Saul reigned forty years (Ac 13), and so on.

In the Fathers of the Church occur many statements of a similar kind. That Simon was the companion of Cleophas on the way to Emmaus was the firm belief of Origen, etc. etc.

A collection and, if possible, an explanation of such unbiblical views would be welcome.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

Religion at the Universal Races Congress.

By the Rev. W. Marwick, Jamaica.

(*A Member of the Congress.*)

Religion generally, and the Christian religion in particular, fills a larger place in the volume of *Papers on Inter-Racial Problems*, prepared for, but held as read and only discussed at, the First Universal Races Congress, than an inspection of the table of contents seems to indicate. Professor Caldecott's paper was not the only one that set forth the Christian standpoint. But it is to be regretted that, though there were a good many Christians present and several took part in the discussions, the 'weight of evangelical Christianity' was not thrown on the side of this Congress as it ought to have been. It was left to the Ethica Societies, in the person of Professor Felix Adler of New York to initiate, and to Mr. Gustave Spiller to organize this Congress, so profoundly religious and ethical in idea and purpose. The volume of Papers, and the Record of the Proceedings when published, ought to be carefully studied, especially by all who profess to believe that 'there is neither barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but all are one in Christ Jesus,' for this Congress illustrates the saying, 'He that is not against us is for us,' nay more, is likely to prove a powerful friend to the spiritual rebirth and religious advance of mankind.

Before the Congress met, an appeal 'To the Preachers of All Religions' was issued in these terms: 'To emphasise the world-embracing aims underlying the Congress, we humbly and yet most urgently request that a sermon or discourse in favour of inter-racial friendliness be delivered on Sunday, July 23rd, or on a day in the week preceding.' A similar appeal was addressed to 'Ministers and Directors of Public Instruction.'

It has to be premised that 'the particular opinions expressed by the writers [in the volume of Papers] are personal, and do not in any way commit the members of the Congress. Dr. Caldecott therefore wrote, not as the official representative of 'evangelical Christianity,' but in his individual capacity, and his paper was one of several dealing with 'The Modern Conscience in relation to Racial Questions (General).' A considerable variety of opinion is therefore to be found as well as plain statement of historic facts about religions, as, *e.g.*, in Professor von Luschan's paper on 'The Anthropological View of Race,' in which he simply says: 'The religions of Buddha and of Christ have each conquered more than 500 millions of men, and Islam spreads from

Arabia as far as the West Coast of Africa, and eastward all through Asia, as far as the Indonesian Archipelago' (p. 21).

Language and Religion as Consolidating and Separating Influences were discussed in two papers, one on 'Language' by Professor D. S. Margoliouth, who also took an active part in the discussions of the Congress, and one on 'Religion' by Professor T. W. and Mrs. Rhys Davids. Religion as a Separating Influence was referred to in one of the papers on 'Fundamental Considerations,' namely, that on 'Race from the Sociological Standpoint,' by Professor Alfred Fouillée, who, in writing of 'ethnic consciousness' 'culminating nearly always in an assumption of *superiority*, and, for that very reason, in a feeling of natural *hostility*, says: 'Differences of language and of custom—and, above all, of religion—serve to intensify the hostility. All religion is sociological in character, and expresses symbolically the conditions native to the life or progress of a given society. The religion of a race converts it into a huge society animated by the same beliefs and the same aspirations. Moreover, all religion is intolerant and hostile to other religions. It believes itself to be the truth, and thus seeks to universalise that which is only the particular spirit of one race or one nation—*e.g.* the Jewish spirit, the Christian spirit, the Mahommedan spirit. When, then, the ethnic consciousness becomes at the same time a religious consciousness, the assertion of the individuality of a race implies a counter assertion to the individuality of other races. It is hidden warfare, passing over at the very first opportunity into open warfare (p. 25). He does not believe in 'religious propaganda.' The different religious beliefs of each race must be respected. 'Religions, through the whole course of history, have too often set nations at variance. If they have produced friendship and union, they have likewise produced discord, hate, and war. There is not a religion which has not, like Lady Macbeth, stains on the hand that all the vast oceans could never wash away' (p. 28). Religion, he holds, is not an 'article of export.' 'The only universal, the only really "catholic" things, in the Greek sense of the word, are science, philosophy, and morals. It is these things which we must peaceably introduce among races the most distant from our own. It is not the Christian religion which has transformed and will continue to transform Japan. It is science and industry. Men of science are to-day the true and only missionaries. The inventors of railroads and telegraphs have done more to link different races together than all the Francis Xaviers and Ignatius Loyolas.' This French scientist is apparently acquainted only with Roman Catholic religious propaganda. His practical conclusion is: 'Try to draw from every religion and every race its whole moral and really social content, and then accept this without troubling about dogmas and particular symbols. In universal religious tolerance, combined with universal morality and science, we have the one great means of establishing mutual racial sympathy' (p. 28). Only thus far a Member of the Institut de France leads us.

But, as Gustav Spiller, in his paper on 'The Problem of Race Equality,' says: 'Anthropologists and travellers often unquestioningly and unsuspectingly assume that the mental traits of races are innate and fixed,' and he quotes from a letter of the first delegate to the Second Hague Conference of one of the greatest Eastern empires to the Congress Executive, the view of the fundamental oneness of humanity which 'ethnic consciousness' cannot destroy: 'Races show nothing but skin-deep differences. Differences of language, of religion, of manners and customs, are nothing but accidental modalities attendant on the respective historical evolution in the past—in no way sufficiently powerful to efface the substratum common to all humanity, and in no way tending to hinder any co-operative effort in the fulfilment of the mission common to mankind in general' (p. 36).

The question of language may be passed over, or, says Professor Margoliouth, 'of the various ties which bind human beings together that of a common language seems to possess no great strength,' and 'even where religion and nationality are able to maintain the inter-breeding group in its purity, they often fail to maintain the national language.' 'Like the Sabbath, like weights and measures, like the coinage, language exists for man, not man for language.' 'The advantage to Europe and to mankind of a common language would be infinitely greater than any loss which could be sustained through the abandonment of a national language' (pp. 59–60).

The question of religion is really more important; but, as Professor and Mrs. Davids remark in opening: 'The more one thinks about this

subject, the more complicated and difficult it appears to be' (p. 62). The necessary facts have not yet been collected, and no attempt has yet been made to deal with the question as a whole by scientific method. The sweeping generalizations of Professor Fouillée may therefore be discounted. Conclusions can as yet be drawn only from isolated instances. 'The violent propagation of Mohammedanism, strewing its path with ruins, but creating vast religious agglomerations, is a good illustration of religion in its twofold aspect of dissociation and aggregation. On the other hand, religion seems to seek the salvation of the individual rather than cohesion in salvation. Often, however, the religious pretext serves to conceal motives of a different kind: the Saracen conquests and the Crusades aimed equally at the possession of rich and coveted lands' (Abstracts of Papers, p. 4).

It is to founders and reformers rather than to propagandists of religion that we are to look for the unifying element in religions. 'Founders and reformers in all religions reveal the great heart that yearns to gather the human brood together in love and concord. But the fierce missioner more often appeals to individual interest' (p. 63). Religion must not be blamed for the lower motives exhibited in so-called religious wars. 'Never has any one of them approached the spiritual plane of the one host or the other in the Holy War dreamt of by our John Bunyan—the celestial armies of the Lord of hosts, and the battalions of evil spirits bent on the spiritual ruin of mankind and the reconquest of heaven. It needs a child's simple faith to people the camps of Crusaders or Covenanters with hearts burning with the white purity and single-mindedness of a Joan of Arc. It is as impossible to imagine the first Christians going forth, sword in hand, to slay unbelievers, as it is to picture a Buddhist, first or last, taking up arms against his fellow-creatures.' The Christian standard is explicitly affirmed in the following sentences: '"Put up thy sword again into the sheath," said Jesus to His first Crusader. "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." Nor can the militant Christian justly infer from the words: "I came not to send peace, but a sword," that it was a Christian's duty to be he who should draw the sword. Unmodified, unqualified for early Christians as for all Buddhists, is St. James's answer to his own question: "Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?"' (p. 64).

The three great roots of man's misery preached by Buddhism are greed, enmity, and *moha*, or unintelligence. 'It was over a Jerusalem that, with unintelligent, uncomprehending orthodoxy, persecuted the messengers of a new and purer word that Jesus wept. 'If thou hadst known,' hadst understood, hadst discerned, 'the things that belong to thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes.' That rulers and statesmen may discern in the rallying and concentrating attending a war, the best occasion for effecting political unity, is conceivable. But it is impossible to conceive any mind that has really grasped the spirit of an ethical religion, of a creed confessing a benevolent deity, to loose the dogs of war upon his fellow-men, or to coerce belief by prison or the stake. The stupidity behind 'man's inhumanity to man' is perhaps the most tragic thing about it' (p. 65).

Unlike Professor Fouillée, Professor and Mrs. Davids realize that the theme—Whether religion be a disintegrating or a consolidating force is no question that can be answered by a bare Yea or Nay. 'Deeply as the religious instinct lies and stirs in the heart of man, it cannot find expression apart from his other instincts, however much it may and does serve as a cloak for them. And accordingly, as these instincts make for social disintegration or solidarity, so will be the religious activity that is pressed into their service. As the handmaid of theology, as the sanction of this or that social institution, as crystallized and formulated into a creed, or a sect within a creed, religion may become racialized. Thus narrowed, it will rather intensify the lines of cleavage between folk and folk, than bring them into closer intercourse. But as an instinct deep-rooted in the heart, religion transcends the barriers of race, in offering the bond of a common aspiration between individuals. And as the day of dogmas wears on to its long twilight, and the true inwardness of religion becomes acknowledged, we may come to invert the relation between religion as pretext, and other motives calling themselves by its name. More and more shall we take other motives as pretext and expression for the religious instinct, which is our being's noblest 'creative impulse.'[1] We shall

[1] Bergson's term, *élan vital et créateur*.

come to suffer the radioactivity of each man's religion to work in the heart as a divine spring of action, and to take, *as its pretexts*, all our aspirations for the general increase of health and knowledge, of beauty and happiness. But still will this inner spiritual fount ever make both for division and for consolidation. Men and women will, in obedience to it, meet ever more and more, as here and now, in amity and ordered effort after mutual understandings and progress in fraternity. Yet no less will the inward monitor bid this man or that woman cultivate selection and solitude; ever will it lead them now to come away and now to approach, as befits the true aristocrat of the Spirit; ever will it urge them now and again to flee alone to the Alone, to feed and recreate the vital spark of divine flame before the altar of the Ideal' (pp. 66–67).

In his paper on 'The World-Position of the Negro and Negroid,' Sir H. H. Johnston, the well-known African traveller and administrator, makes a striking contribution incidentally to the place of religion in discussing the question of education among subject races. If the opponents of the introduction of education are right, 'The mischief began,' he says, 'not with the introduction of modern education into India fifty years ago, or a hundred years ago, or, first, the setting free, and, secondly, the missionary education of the natives of Africa and the negroes of America, but with the mission and the teaching of Christ.'

Referring to Sakya-Muni, the Buddha, as a notable forerunner of Jesus Christ, he says: 'Had Buddha's teaching not been swamped by Mongolian petty-mindedness and Dravidian dreams, it might have done the work of Christianity. Undoubtedly it was a revolt against the caste prejudice of the Aryan, and its fundamental teaching was the racial equality of all men. But its ultimate effect on Asia has been of little purport. . . . But, strange to say, the teaching of Christ and His apostles . . . has possessed some unconquerable surviving influence, which began to make itself felt from the end of the fifteenth century in the humanitarian teachings of both Catholic and Protestant. These doctrines prevailed sufficiently on the public opinion of the white world not only to hold back the white man (when he had the power) from exterminating or dehumanizing the dark-skinned races which had become subject to him; but prevailed even to force him to extend the gospel of Christ to those peoples, to regard them theoretically as equally men with his own race, and, above all, to give them the advantages of a European education' (pp. 334–335).

Although put hypothetically, one can read between the lines of the following contrasted views of the worth of Christianity: 'For aught I know, the teaching of Christ may have been the work of reactionary Nature: judging from the writings of not a few among my fellow-countrymen and others in the United States and in Germany, it must have been a wrong idea, since its practical application would inevitably tend to draw all branches of the human race together, with the ultimate result of racial fusion, of equal privileges for all human beings possessing the same degree of education, of moral and physical worth. On the other hand, the coming and teaching of Christ may have been the most remarkable event in the history of the human species since man definitely emerged from apehood; and the logical carrying out of Christian principles may lead not only to the gradual extinction of race-hatred, envy and malice, but more quickly to the formation of the perfect man than might be brought about under other religious systems' (p. 335).

Still more explicitly does Sir H. H. Johnston express his views on Christianity in the remarkable article in the August *Contemporary Review*, entitled 'Racial Problems and the Congress of Races': 'The Christian principles that were laid down in the authentic Gospels and Epistles still remain unsurpassed as a rule of conduct, as a basis of practical ethics,' and his plea is: 'If only in this battle [against natural forces] we could agree upon a common Inter-racial Religion, and that the most simple undogmatic form of Christianity—Christianity without the creeds that were unknown to Christ!' Not that he desires to do away with the creeds and liturgies of Christendom and the other great religions. 'If some such Inter-racial Congress . . . could define a religious basis on which all nations and civilized races could agree . . . and on this basis regulate their inter-racial, international dealings, then in their own homes and local temples they could still continue to carry on other forms of worship of divine, human, animal, vegetable, or meteoric attributes (one word "Divine" covers all these phases of life

and energy), such as were not inconsistent with the principles of the basic religion. There could still survive the stately ritual of the Latin Church, the beautiful service of the Anglican Cathedral, even the more reasonable practices of Jain Buddhism and the prayers to Allah as seen through the mental vista of pure-minded Mohammedans.'

Whether any Congress, representative either of Races or Religions of Educators or of Christian Missionaries, or a World Congress representative of all could agree upon 'a common Inter-racial Religion,' may be doubted; but that each of these Congresses held since the opening of the twentieth century have made, and will continue to make, valuable contributions to a better understanding of the problems of race, religion, and education, cannot be doubted. Meanwhile we do well to note, with Professor Caldecott, that 'the three propagandist Religions are now definitely and explicitly dissociated from race-privileges,' and hope that 'those religions which are still closely attached to race-limitations will, when brought into mutual conference, be affected by the sentiment of unity, and consider seriously for themselves the possibility of a new valuation of their separative features' (p. 303). 'I hope we may take it,' he adds, 'that all the religions which include a desire to extend their influence will be glad both to contribute counsel and to receive it, in the important task of selecting the *universalia* of humane ethical and social order' (p. 310). And so may be brought to light the universalistic and idealistic elements of religions that are ethnic and non-propagandist, 'so that we may all proceed together in a common task' (p. 310).

Entre Nous.

Poetry.

Among the books of poetry of the month the first place should be given to a new volume of Dr. John Brownlie's translations from the Service Books of the Holy Eastern Church. It is the sixth volume that Dr. Brownlie has thus translated and published. Its title is *Hymns from the Morningland* (Paisley: Gardner; 3s. 6d. net).

Let the next be a little thing on *St. John in the Isle of Patmos*, by Alfred L. Woodard (Allenson; 1s. net).

O God of the Sunlight, sweep away
The memory of that evil day,
That drags me down to death:
Wash me, and draw me up above,
Cleanse me in Thine own cleansing love,
With Thine own quickening breath:
Make me one with the endless sea;
One with the wind on the rain-drenched lea—
One with Thee—God of Love.

The man who could write that has felt. He who calls for cleansing with such passionate utterance will find cleansing, and through much tribulation enter the Kingdom. The poetry in Desmond Mountjoy's *The Hills of Hell* (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net) is not all at that height of passion. Nor is it always the expression of so manifest an aspiration. The very next poem is entitled 'Cui Bono?'

I have cast my sword at the feet of the foe,
Now Evil may come and Good may go:
Impatient of Wrong, yet hopeless of Right,
I have lost the spirit and will to fight.

But it is poetry. And where the author does not give help he needs help.

The surest touch among all the volumes of the month is found in John Drinkwater's *Poems of Men and Hours* (David Nutt). And there is a wideness in it like the wideness of God's mercy. For John Drinkwater recognizes God in the Universe and in his own life. Thus his outlook is more comprehensive, his insight more reliable. We may quote:

THE SOLDIER.

The large report of fame I lack,
And shining clasps and crimson scars,
For I have held my bivouac
Alone amid the untroubled stars.

My battlefield has known no dawn
Beclouded by a thousand spears;
I've been no mounting tyrant's pawn
To buy his glory with my tears.

It never seemed a noble thing
Some little leagues of land to gain
From broken men, nor yet to fling
Abroad the thunderbolts of pain.

Yet I have felt the quickening breath
As peril heavy peril kissed—
My weapon was a little faith,
And fear was my antagonist.

Not a brief hour of cannonade,
But many hours of bitter strife,
Till God of His great pity laid
Across my brow the leaves of life.

Never before were there so many women who could write poetry. Or at any rate never before were there so many who did write poetry. Verse makers there have been in plenty among the women of every generation, but poetry is another matter. Margaret Blaikie is one of our poets. In her new volume, *Songs by the Way* (Fifield), there is not a line but is poetry. And sometimes it is poetry of a high imagination and a daring creed. Take this poem on Cain for a witness. The title is:

BROTHERS.

Cain my brother, my elder brother,
Hearken, I cry to thee.
Pardon me for thy fault, O brother,
Pardon me.
Mine was the sin,—now mine the pain,
Brother Cain.

I cried to the Just to avenge my death.
The Just accuseth me.
Mine was the guilt of the dreadful death,
(Hearken to me.)
Mine the sin of that crimson stain,
Brother Cain.

Oft in the field, at the fold, my brother,
I angered thee,
Taunted thee in my pride, O brother,
(Pardon me.)
Pardon the sin of my disdain,
Brother Cain.

Mine was the guilt, all mine, my brother,
(Hearken to me.)
My heart cries to thy heart, loved brother,
Pardon me.
Pardon him whom his pride hath slain,
Brother Cain.

The admirers of Mr. H. G. Wells are admirers of his short stories. Few of the great novelists can write short stories. But Mr. Wells can. More than that, he can tell what a short story should be. He has rigidly rejected, he has banned and burned quite a number of short stories which he has written, and all the rest, he says, that are worth keeping he has gathered into a single volume and called it *The Country of the Blind* (Nelson; 2s. net).

Under the title of *Comfortable Words for Christ's Lovers*, the Rev. Dundas Harford, M.A., has described and edited the MS. of Lady Julian's Visions which was discovered recently at Lord Amherst's sale and purchased for the British Museum (Allenson; 1s. 6d. net). It is really, in the opinion of this editor, the first edition of the Revelations, the longer form being the outcome of twenty years' meditation.

A fairy book, and a fairy book that is really meant for children, is a book called *Nature Stories* written by Louie Jesse (Pitman; 2s. 6d. net). The illustrations match the narrative. Both belong unmistakably to the real world of imagination.

Canon Jessopp's Sermons.

The following letter is published in the *Guardian* for September 1: Sir,—I have a stock of old sermons which must approach a thousand in number, very few of which I shall ever preach again; and yet they have their merits and might peradventure be useful to other preachers, young and old. They have been preached to very different congregations — villagers, townsmen, learned Societies (including three Universities), soldiers, sailors, Inns-of-Court, Chapels Royal, four or five Cathedrals, Westminster Abbey—on special occasions and by special appointment. But far the larger number of these sermons have

been preached before country villagers, among whom the greater part of my life has been passed during the last thirty years.

My preaching days are over, and I shall preach no more. I very rarely preach from a MS. now. I have drawers full of my old homilies, and a manuscript sermon is of very little use to me. My habit for long has been to preach without book, as the phrase has it, and that for more reasons than one, on which I need not dwell. I shall not often preach again 'with book or without it.'

I know that scores, and more than merely scores, of my old sermons are worth preaching, and that they ought to be preached for the good of ordinary congregations. When I pick them out for delivery I am often surprised at their force, their earnestness, their acuteness, and their eloquence. The conviction has been growing upon me that these sermons of mine deserve to be delivered in other churches and other pulpits than these where they were preached in years gone by.

I venture to make an offer to my clerical brethren who, in so many cases, have a quite inadequate time for preparing the weekly sermons. I am prepared to offer my younger clerical brethren little bundles of my old sermons which have done duty during the last forty years or so, if they will give a promise never to preach any sermon of mine till they have read it twice aloud before they make use of it in the pulpit. And if they will read it once in silence, and with the eye also, all the better for them and their congregations.

My preaching days are over, but if my juniors can with earnestness and humility avail themselves of such sympathetic help as I should be glad to afford them, let them by all means enter into correspondence with me. It may be that my counsel may prove useful, and my sympathy afford some small measure of guidance if a correspondence should ensue.

AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, Rector of Scarning.

Scarning Rectory, Norfolk.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. H. J. Allen, Moresby Rectory, Whitehaven.

Illustrations for the Great Text for November must be received by the 1st of October. The text is Ps 119^{105}.

The Great Text for December is Ps 126^{6}:

'Though he goeth on his way weeping,
bearing forth the seed;
He shall come again with joy, bringing
his sheaves with him.'

A copy of Dean's *Visions and Revelations*, or of Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 139^{7}:

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'

A copy of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, or Kennett's *Early Ideals of Righteousness*, together with any volume of the 'Epoch Makers' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Is 28^{16}—'Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts,' or Durell's *The Self-Revelation of Our Lord*, or Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for March is Rom. 15^{4}—'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.' A copy of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The Church Congress met this year at Stoke. It was not so well attended as last year's Congress, which met in Cambridge. For last year was the jubilee year of the Congress, and Cambridge is better than Stoke for those who delight in Congresses. Yet it was at Stoke and not at Cambridge that the most revolutionary word ever heard at a Congress was spoken. When all the rest are forgotten, the Congress at Stoke is likely to be remembered.

It was in a sermon that this word was spoken, in a sermon by the Bishop of London. When the Congress met at Stoke, in the heart of the Potteries, the conviction seems to have been borne in upon the mind of the Bishop of London, that the place was suitable and the time opportune for inviting the Church of England to a departure in policy that can scarcely be carried out without a revolution.

For the doctrine of the Church of England has hitherto been, that for those who are unhappy here a heaven of happiness is waiting beyond the grave. Its practice has been to leave them therefore in their unhappiness. But the Bishop of London sees clearly now that those who are unhappy here decline the offer of a future heaven of happiness. They demand that they shall at least have the chance of being happy here. This demand, in the language of his text, the Bishop calls 'new wine.' And he asks his fellow-Churchmen at the Church Congress, Do they intend to let this 'new wine' burst the 'old bottles' of Church doctrine and practice, or are they ready to provide new bottles for it?

'There is a strong new wine working in the hearts and brains of thousands to-day. Thousands believe to-day that there is a possibility of equality of opportunity for all. Thousands believe that this grinding poverty which some of us have seen in great cities before our eyes is unnecessary, and should come to an end. Thousands look forward with hope to a day when each child shall have a chance, and no one shall be—to use a terrible phrase—"damned into the world." Thousands believe that literally a Kingdom of God is "at hand." They are tired of hearing of a heaven in another world; they believe they were promised a heaven on earth. They complain, with Clough, of Christian people that—

> They mark off so much sky
> And call it Heaven;
> Place bliss and glory there,
> Plant perfect homes in the unsubstantial sky,
> And say what is not will be by and by.'

The Bishop of London does not invite the Church of England to deny the existence of

heaven. He even invites his fellow-Churchmen to think more of heaven, less of earth—for themselves; but he entreats them to think more of earth and less of heaven for others. For he says that thousands of men and women are set upon seeing at least the beginning of a heaven upon earth. He says it is a modest heaven. 'It is not large mansions or princely incomes. It is more time to think and greater leisure from toil, a living wage and a help towards being independent in old age instead of going to the workhouse, co-operation the ruling motive of life and work instead of cut-throat competition, and peace among nations instead of war.'

Now all this is no doubt evident enough and enough platitudinous. And if the Bishop of London had said no more than this, he would have received the applause and probably the heartfelt thanks of the Church Congress. But when he proceeded to say, 'This is the beautiful dream which is at the bottom of the Labour movement in this country, and which I found animating Labour Day last summer in Canada, and which, though mixed up with many unsatisfactory elements, is, I expect, the inspiration of what is called "Socialism" abroad, and the cause of the tremendous strides which it has made'; and when he asked, 'What Christian can deny that the dream is a beautiful and a Christian dream, and that the wine in itself, undiluted, might have been created at Cana of Galilee?' —then the men and women who were present knew for what purpose God's hand had been heavy on them to bring them to Stoke.

There are two important facts about the Labour movement in this country which force themselves upon the attention of the Bishop of London. The first is, that it is a religious movement. The second is, that it is outside the Church.

It is a religious movement. 'The Labour movement in this country,' says Dr. Winnington Ingram, 'is avowedly and definitely religious.' And he recommends any one who doubts the statement to send to the Warden of Browning Hall, Walworth, for a pamphlet entitled *Christ and Labour*, which contains addresses delivered in Labour Week of the present year by eleven Labour Members of Parliament. He makes quotations from these addresses. This quotation from the address of Mr. Parker, M.P. for Halifax, is a fair example. His topic is the Power of Vision. He says: 'It is our business to keep the Vision in front of us—that we have to work for the other fellow, to give to the whole of the people a life worthy of the living. So only can we accomplish the purpose of the Divine Master, whom we all, I am sure, in our heart of hearts desire to follow.'

But while it is a religious movement, it is outside organized Christianity, it is outside the Church. 'Why,' asks the Bishop of London, 'do scarcely any of these men belong to the Church of England? Why in the recent strike had the Church so little influence? Why do they not turn, as you would naturally suppose they would, to the Church which was founded two thousand years ago to preach and teach these very ideas, and to hold up just this ideal to the world? Why are these men not looking more than they are to the historic Church of Jesus Christ for sympathy, guidance, and advice?' He answers his own questions.

The first answer he gives is that Church people are influenced by class prejudice. It was a difficult thing to say. The Church people who heard him were 'probably the kindest-hearted people in the world,' 'clergy and clergy's wives and daughters, men and women who toil day and night for the good of their parishioners, who would give, and perhaps have given, the coat off their backs for the poor committed to their charge.' Quoting the layman who writes *Across the Bridges*, 'The black guard,' said the Bishop of London, 'never fails.'

And yet: 'We clergy are largely drawn from one class. The lay people who have leisure to attend such a Congress as this are wholly drawn from that class. We are apt to like the poor so long as they keep in their proper place. We read our class newspapers, and hear our class conversation over the tea-table or after dinner, and in all we do and say class feeling insensibly makes itself felt.'

And what is the effect of this class feeling? It makes it simply impossible for man or woman of the one class to show sympathy for man or woman of the other. Real sympathy requires that heart be put to heart and mind to mind. 'Unless we realize,' says Dr. INGRAM, 'that that young workman is as proud and sensitive as our own young brother who has come home from the university or from Sandhurst; unless we realize that he does not really want charity or pity or being preached at any more than the other; that he wants to stand on his own feet and look the whole world in the face, and have a man's life with some leisure in it and time to read and think, and an honourable opportunity to court his girl and a home to take her to, and that nothing else that we can give him will do instead, nothing else but the treatment of a man—until we realize that, we have not given him the sympathy which we so desire to give.'

And what the young men need, the girls and women need also. Not clubs and mothers' meetings only. Not good advice only. That girl must have shorter hours. She ought never to hear what she has to hear where she works. 'Her soul,' says the Bishop of London, 'is the soul of a queen. She is a daughter of God. She should be able to carry her head, as your girl does, with the proud consciousness of perfect innocence, and be able, though she works in a pottery, to lay her crown of flawless purity at the feet of her Saviour when she meets Him at the last.'

'That young mother should not work in a factory at all. She should be the keeper of the home. She should have rest before the child is born and rest after, if the children of the nation are to be its joy. It is not enough to give her a little good advice at the Mothers' Meeting about not taking stimulants or drugs; she should have a life in which she will not feel the need of either—a life in which she can play her true part as wife and mother, while the man has a wage which will keep the whole family from want.'

What is it that has kept the Church of England from accomplishing this? Is it class prejudice alone? There is another reason.

'It happened,' says the Bishop of London, 'that at the same time this summer that I was studying the addresses given in Labour Week, I was also reading the last two volumes of the singularly interesting *History of the Church of England*, edited by the late Dean of Winchester. These last two volumes are by the Vice-Provost of Eton, and bring the history of the Church down to the present time. The first volume consists of 350 pages, and the second of 450. They give a perfectly frank and true account of what the Church of England has been really interested in during the last hundred years, of the subjects which have crowded its meetings, excited its debates, and sometimes almost torn it to pieces. Of these 800 pages about 400 are devoted to the Ritual question. Are vestments to be worn or not? Is incense to be burnt or not? Is a stole legal? Now I should be the last to deny the importance of some of these controversies, but it is hard to realize how trivial, how petty, many of them must have seemed to the toiling millions of our fellow-countrymen. There they were, fighting and struggling for daily bread; here were we convulsed with the question of the legality of a stole.'

'Revive thy work, O Lord.' The prayer proceeds uninterruptedly. It is the prayer of thousands; it is a prayer of faith. Yet no revival comes. Is it possible that such a revival as we pray for would not be good for us?

Professor T. B. KILPATRICK, of Toronto, has written a book on *New Testament Evangelism* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.). He does not confound evangelism with revivalism. 'It ought to be stated, clearly and emphatically,' he says, 'that to make evangelism a synonym of revivalism is to be untrue to the teaching of the New Testament.' Evangelism is the work of man, revivalism is the work of God. To evangelize is to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation through Christ. A revival may be the result of the proclamation, and it may not. But if it is—and this is the point—the character of the evangelism will determine the quality of the revival.

It is necessary, then, that we should not only pray for a revival, but also work for the right kind of revival. Of what character ought the evangelism to be that the fruit of it may be a revival that will be good for us?

First, the message delivered must be complete. A revival of a kind, says Dr. KILPATRICK, may be and has been given on an inadequate gospel. But it may be that at the present time God is waiting until the gospel is proclaimed in its fulness. Let us enlarge it to the depth of human need and to the scope of divine revelation. And let us attend to the balance of parts, not emphasizing one element in its discovery of God or its appeal to man, to the exclusion of others, but recognizing the manifoldness of the grace of God.

After the message the evangelist. For Dr. KILPATRICK has nothing but contempt for the miserable quibble that separates the man from the messenger. 'The power of God to save does not operate magically, whether through a rite or a book or an uttered phrase. It operates normally, upon men, through men. It must therefore manifest itself in those who preach the gospel as a regenerative and sanctifying energy before it can be proclaimed to others as capable of achieving like results in their experience. *An un-Christlike evangelist is a moral horror.*'

Can Dr. KILPATRICK tell us, then, what is the right kind of revival to expect and pray for? It is a revival, he says, that has depth, extension, and permanence.

It has depth. To preach Christ truly is to break up the deeps of the human spirit, to lead to great repentance and a mighty decision, and to inaugurate revolutionary changes in life and character.

It has extension. To preach Christ truly is to proclaim Him Lord of all. It is to include within His sovereignty the whole of life. A revival which makes a speciality of 'holiness,' while neglecting the plain virtues of truthfulness and integrity, is a scandalous misrepresentation of the demands of the gospel and the claims of Christ.

And it has permanence. To preach Christ truly is to preach Him as the abiding source of redemptive power, to summon men to a continual activity of trust and obedience, and to keep them in solemn remembrance of the final estimate of life at which the Saviour shall preside as Judge.

When the historian of the reign of David had completed his history, he found that there were mighty men whose deeds he had left unrecorded. And he gathered them all together, men and deeds, and placed them one after another in the 23rd chapter of the Second Book of Samuel. Of these men, the mightiest in the opinion of after ages, though they are not placed first by the historian, are three who broke through the Philistine garrison, and fetched David the water that he longed for from the well of Bethlehem.

The historian's purpose is to describe the three warriors and their mighty deed. But in doing so he describes David. It was at the hottest time of the wars with the Philistines. David had the worst of it, and had taken refuge in the cave of

Adullam, while the garrison of the Philistines was in possession of Bethlehem. David's mind returned to the scenes of his early youth. Every spot desecrated by the presence of the Philistine host was familiar to him. There was nothing he would not have dared in order to drive the Philistine garrison out of Bethlehem. Suddenly his desire and his powerlessness met together. The thought of one particular well of water came overwhelmingly upon him, its refreshing coolness, its utter inaccessibility. The cry escaped him: 'Oh that one would give me water to drink of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate!' The three men heard it. They brake through the host of the Philistines and drew water from the well of Bethlehem, which was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David. But he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord. And he said, 'Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should do this: Shall I drink the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?'

Not many of the mighty deeds which history has recorded move us more than this. There is not a flaw in it or in the record of it. The David who longed for the water of the well of Bethlehem is the David who has won the heart of humanity. The David who would not drink of the water, but poured it out unto the Lord, is the David who has moved the souls of the most religious among men.

Now, there are two discoveries which men have to make in life, and that day David made them both. The first discovery is the value of water, and the second is the value of blood.

David that day discovered the value of water. It is one of the necessaries of life; in the East it is the greatest of all. Is not the earliest song on record the Song of the Well? There was no way in which the ruler of a nation could more beneficially occupy himself than in the digging of wells. There was no way by which an invading army could more speedily bring the people to submission than by stopping up the wells of water.

It is one of the necessaries of life. And like all the necessaries of life it is a gift of God. But it has to be toiled for. To be sent to be hewers of wood and drawers of water—it was almost the degradation of toil and barely removed from slavery. See how the worn stone at the mouth of the well speaks of the times that women have 'come hither to draw,' and the gladness with which they would have welcomed any promise of relief from the drudgery.

David had often drunk of the water of the well of Bethlehem in the careless spring morning of his youth. Now he knew the value of it. He had come through much toil, he had suffered many disappointments, since he drank so carelessly of the water of the well of Bethlehem that is by the gate. Life had proved harder than he expected, harder, it may be, than he thought he had a right to expect. He no longer fancied that the earth was an easy place to live in. He had come to take life seriously. But it was not till that sudden longing came upon him for the water of the well of Bethlehem that he realized how difficult life is. It was not until the three men returned with the water that he understood how much it costs to provide life even with its necessaries.

This, then, is the first great discovery that we have to make. We have to discover the value of water. To some it comes early. And sometimes it is very pitiful to see the careful face above the half-developed body. Yet these are not the most to be pitied. More to be pitied are they who above the broad chest of manhood carry a face that has no lines of care in it.

The other great discovery is the value of blood. David made it at the same time. It was when the men returned with the water that he discovered the value of water, and it was when they returned with the water that he discovered the value of

blood. For the blood is the life. These men had gone in jeopardy of their lives to bring the water. And when they brought it, he would not drink of it. He said, It is the blood of the men. And he poured it out unto the Lord.

What does the world say? It says David was a fool for his pains, a sentimental fool. For the world, which has taken him home to its heart because he was so human and longed for the water of the well of Bethlehem, sees no sense in the pouring out of the water when he got it. Of course, the men went in jeopardy of their lives. That is what men are for. And if we are to consider the cost of all the necessaries of life, the cost to other people, when should we have time for life's enjoyments?

'The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he reasoned within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have not where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns and build greater; and there will I bestow all my corn and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool.'

Thou fool? What had he done? He had learned the value of water. Life was no plaything to him. He had toiled in youth and he had toiled in manhood. If he had prospered, he knew what it had cost him. 'I will pull down my barns and build greater.' Why should he not? But God said unto him, Thou fool. He had learned the value of water. But he had not learned the value of blood.

The Missionary Idea in the Gospels.

By Professor the Rev. George Jackson, B.A., Victoria College, Toronto, Canada.

From two different quarters the call comes to us to-day for a re-examination of the charter of missionary enterprise. On the one hand, the revival of missionary interest and effort, which received such unexampled expression in the Edinburgh Conference of last year, is leading men to investigate anew the whole ground of the missionary appeal. On the other hand, modern New Testament criticism, in its attempt to get behind the reporters of Jesus to Jesus Himself, sometimes questions our right to use—or at least to use in the old way—some of the texts which have long done duty in the missionary cause. The moment, therefore, seems opportune for considering afresh the nature and strength of the missionary argument as it is to be found in the Gospels. When we send our missionaries to press the Christian faith on the peoples of other lands, is our action in line with Christ's own purpose? Can the appeal to the Churches at home plead His sovereign sanction and authority? St. Paul, we know, was a missionary; his eager spirit broke the bonds of Jewish exclusiveness and drove him forth on the world's highways to make known unto all men the gospel of the grace of God; but Jesus lived and died within the narrow limits of the Holy Land. Then is it to Paul rather than to Jesus that we must look as the founder of missions? Here, shall we say, is another example of the way in which the strong and masterful personality of the Apostle has dominated the whole Christian Church; or, may we see behind St. Paul the figure of Another who said once, and who says still, to all who believe in Him, 'Go ye into all the world'? Such is our question. In seeking to answer it I shall, for well understood reasons, limit myself mainly to the first three Gospels.

I.

And at once it has to be admitted that our missionary 'texts' are neither so numerous nor so conclusive as perhaps we have been led to expect. There is, of course, the Great Commis-

sion given by our Lord to His disciples after His resurrection, and reported in varying forms in our first three Gospels and in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.[1] But when we turn back to the records of Christ's life and teaching during the years of His public ministry, we are surprised, and perhaps disappointed, to find that there is so little that we can set beside it. There are, it is true, not a few sayings and parables that foreshadow the universal mission of Christianity. Thus, for example, Jesus spoke of His disciples as 'the light of the world,' and 'the salt of the earth.'[2] He said that He would build His church and that the gates of Hades should not prevail against it.[3] When a woman anointed Him in the house of Simon at Bethany, He declared that that which she had done should be spoken of for a memorial of her 'wheresoever the gospel should be preached throughout the whole world.'[4] Still more explicit was His word that before 'the end' came 'the gospel must first be preached unto all the nations.'[5] And once, when His soul was suddenly and deeply moved by the faith of a centurion, there appeared before Him a vision of multitudes coming from the east and the west to sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven.[6] Of similar significance are the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven,[7] the seed springing in secret,[8] and of the wicked husbandmen—the latter with its word of solemn warning to the Jews: 'Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.'[9] But outside the Great Commission we search the story of Christ's life in vain for any such explicit or repeated injunctions on the subject of world-evangelization as may be found, for example, concerning the use of wealth, or the duty and practice of prayer. Nor is this all. Even the sayings which have just been quoted, including the Great Commission itself, cannot be received at their face value until we have made our reckoning with at least two difficulties which challenge the student of the Gospels to-day.

1. In the first place, there is a small group of Christ's sayings in which He Himself appears to disclaim all thought of a world-wide mission. Thus, when He sent forth the Twelve, He charged them, saying: 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . . Verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come.'[10] Again, when the Syro-Phœnician woman besought Him that He would cast forth the devil out of her daughter, He answered and said, 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. . . . It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs.'[11] Furthermore, it is undeniable, however we may explain these sayings, that they indicate with rough accuracy the limits—the self-imposed limits—of Christ's own ministry. He Himself went not into any way of the Gentiles. His intercourse with them was rare and casual. Other sheep He had which were not of the Jewish fold, but the shepherding of them He left to other hands.

These things the Gospels tell us; and we can well believe that it was to facts and sayings such as these that the Jewish Christians would make their appeal in their opposition to the larger gospel of St. Paul. The same appeal is sometimes made to-day by those who look upon missions rather as an after-thought of the disciples than a part of the original purpose of Jesus. Harnack, for example, concludes, especially from the saying concerning the coming of the Son of Man, that 'the Gentile mission cannot have lain within the horizon of Jesus.'[12] Do the facts warrant the conclusion? The single saying emphasized by Harnack undoubtedly presents serious difficulties of its own which it is impossible just now to discuss; but it is surely unnecessary, in order to give a reasonable explanation of the restrictions which Jesus laid upon the Twelve, and which He observed Himself, to say that the universal mission of Christ lay beyond the scope of His thought and purpose.

For consider: do not the very restrictions imply and reveal a consciousness on some one's part that the gospel which the Twelve were sent to preach was fitted for a wider world than Judaism? Why should Jesus say, 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles; enter not into any city of the Samaritans,' unless already to His mind or to theirs the thought were present: this is a message not for the Jew only, but for all men? But the disciples, we are sure, as yet, had no such thought. What Jew

[1] Mt $28^{19.\ 20}$, Mk 16^{15}, Lk 24^{47} *seq.*, Ac 1^{8}.
[2] Mt $5^{13.\ 14}$. [3] Mt 16^{18}. [4] Mk 14^{9}. [5] Mk 13^{10}.
[6] Mt 8^{10}. [7] Mt 13^{31-33}. [8] Mk 4^{26-29}. [9] Mt 21^{33-43}.
[10] Mt $10^{5.\ 6.\ 23}$. [11] Mt 15^{24} *seq.*; cf. Mk 7^{27}.
[12] *Expansion of Christianity*, p. 41 (footnote).

of Palestine in Christ's day would have planned a mission to Gentile dogs or half-heathen Samaritans? It is Christ's own thought which His words reveal. Moreover, is not the fact just named itself a sufficient explanation of the restricted commission? The Twelve as yet were manifestly disqualified for missionary labour in the region beyond. How could they, with their closely-clinging prejudices, be made the bearers of glad tidings to Samaritans and Gentiles whom they hated and despised? They were ready to call down fire from heaven upon them; they were wholly unready to preach to them the gospel of the kingdom of God. And still further, is it not reasonable to suppose that the limitations which at this stage Christ both imposed and observed were only prudential and temporary and with a view to the wider development which history was soon to reveal? 'Give me a fulcrum for my lever,' said the old Greek mathematician, 'and I will move the world.' And it was in Judaism that Jesus sought the fulcrum for the lever of His gospel. Or, to change the figure, just as a military commander, bent on the conquest of a great territory, will resolutely restrict himself, in the earlier stages of his campaign, to the securing of a safe and strong base of operations, and will do this, just because it is the conquest of the whole country that he is planning, so in the beginning did Jesus limit Himself to one small land, only that in the end His disciples might win their way to the uttermost parts of the earth.

2. Our second difficulty is of a more serious and embarrassing character, and cannot be disposed of so readily. It arises from the application to our Gospels of modern methods of critical inquiry. Let it be said at once that it is as vain as it is mistaken to imagine that we can rail off the New Testament literature and turn back the critic with a 'warning to trespassers.' In all our records of the past there is what is called, 'the contemporary equation.' 'Each document contains a standpoint as well as a subject.'[1] The white light of truth reaches us tinged by the human medium through which it has passed. And the equation, the standpoint, the colour due to the medium, have all to be taken into account. This is the task of criticism. Before the historical student can use his sources he must test them, patiently and without prejudice. And from this preliminary testing our sources, the Christian Scriptures, cannot hope to escape. Nor ought we to wish that they could. From criticism which is without bias, and which takes all the facts into account, we have nothing to fear, we have much to hope. And if, as not unfrequently happens, the critic does not know how to be fair—if he is ridden by theories of what he thinks 'must be' or 'cannot be,' if he seeks to re-write the facts rather than to interpret them; above all, if he is blind and deaf to the realities of the spiritual world,—then the remedy lies, not in the rejection of the critical method, but in seeking to give to it a juster and more self-consistent application.

How, then, does it fare at the hands of criticism with those sayings in the Gospels which we have been wont to use as our missionary texts? Let us take, first, the little group of sayings which were brought together at the beginning of this lecture, and in which is foreshadowed the universal mission of Christianity, and let us see how these are dealt with by a modern New Testament scholar like Harnack. In his work, *The Expansion of Christianity*, there is a chapter entitled 'Jesus Christ and the Universal Mission according to the Gospels.' It opens with this statement: 'We cannot but admit that Mark and Matthew have consistently withstood the temptation to introduce the Gentile mission into the words and deeds of Jesus.' But Harnack only reaches this result by a very liberal, and, as many of his readers will feel, a very arbitrary use of the critical pitchfork. Thus, for example, the sayings in the Sermon on the Mount —'ye are the light of the world,' 'ye are the salt of the earth'—and the words, 'for all the nations,' in Mk 11^{17}, we are told 'we may disregard'; but in neither case are we told why. Similarly, in Christ's words to the Syro-Phœnician woman, 'Let the children first be filled,' the 'first,' we read, 'is not to be pressed.' True; but neither is it to be suppressed. The warning in the parable of the husbandman—'The kingdom of God shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof'—refers not to the Gentiles, but to the 'nation,' as opposed to the official Israel; the statement that, before the end comes 'the gospel must first be preached unto all nations' is 'a historical theologoumenon,' put into the lips of Jesus, 'which hardly came from Him in its present form'; the saying that sprang out of the anointing at Bethany —'wheresoever the gospel shall be preached

[1] J. Moffatt's *Historical New Testament*, p. 9.

throughout the whole world,' etc. — 'simply represents a remark which readily acquired a heightened colour from the fact of the subsequent mission to the world.' After this it can hardly surprise us to be told that Mark 'was determined to keep the Gentile mission apart from the gospel'; that Matthew 'consistently retains the setting of the latter within the Jewish nation,' and that Luke's standpoint 'does not differ from that of the two previous evangelists.'[1]

Let us turn now to the more crucial question of the Great Commission. And here, again, we are met by the doubts or denials of criticism. Harnack is quite sure that Jesus never issued such a command as is contained in the closing verses of Matthew's Gospel, 'but that this reading of His life was due to the historical developments of a later age.'[2] In similar fashion Dr. James Moffatt, in his *Historical New Testament*, attributes the words, not to Jesus, but to 'the later spirit of the Church.'[3] Dr. A. B. Bruce, too, though he believes that a universal mission had its place in the mind of Christ, yet nevertheless inclines to the opinion that the words in Matthew's Gospel are not so much 'a report of what the risen Jesus said to His disciples at a given time and place, as rather a summary of what the Apostolic Church understood to be the will of the exalted Lord.'[4]

What, now, shall we say to all this? Obviously we cannot claim for Matthew that he has preserved for us the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord. Apart from the fact that this particular saying, like many of the sayings of Jesus, may in its form owe something to the prepossessions of His reporters, Matthew's account of the Commission differs from Mark's, and Luke's from both, so that any claim to verbal exactness is manifestly out of the question. What, however, we may and must maintain is that behind these varying forms lies the substance of the Great Commission. Dr. Denney puts the case with his usual moderation and lucidity when he says: 'How much the form of it may owe to the conditions of transmission, repetition, condensation, and even interpolation, we may not be able precisely to say, since these conditions must have varied indefinitely, and in ways we cannot calculate; but the *fact* of a great charge, the general import of which was thoroughly understood, seems indisputable. All the Gospels give it in one form or another; and even if we concede that the language in which it is expressed owes something to the Church's consciousness of what it had come to possess through its risen Lord, this does not affect in the least the fact that every known form of the evangelic tradition puts such a charge, or instruction, or commission, into the lips of Jesus after His resurrection.'[5] Of course, if any one has made up his mind beforehand that Jesus could not and did not appear to His disciples after His death in the way our Gospels represent—and it is not unfair to say that a good deal of contemporary criticism goes to work on this assumption—it will be incumbent upon him to get rid, in some way or other, of all the post-resurrection sayings which they put into Christ's lips. But no such presuppositions, whatever may be the intellectual necessities of those who make them, are any evidence against the genuineness of the evangelic tradition. 'Granting,' as Dr. Denney says, 'that the Resurrection was, what our only authorities report it to be, the manifestation of Jesus in another mode of being in which it was possible for Him, at least for a time, and when He would, to have communication with His own—granting this, there is no reason why He should not have said such things to them as the Gospels tell us He did say.'[6]

And when we turn the page, when, *i.e.*, we pass from the Gospels to the Acts, we find in the subsequent and almost immediate history of the Church every reason why He should have said such things. 'After the disciples were convinced that Jesus was no longer dead,' writes Harnack, 'they at once started to preach Him and His gospel with the utmost ardour. This was inevitable in the nature of things.'[7] Well, whatever we may think about 'the nature of things,' to no one who shares the New Testament feeling for Christ and His gospel, will either the ardour or the inevitableness of the disciples' preaching present any difficulty. But surely the most reasonable and adequate explanation of the abounding missionary activity, of which the Book of Acts is the record, is that behind it all lies the definite authority of

[1] The quotations are all from chap. iv. of Harnack's work. I am indebted for some pointed criticism of Harnack's position to two articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (October and November 1907), by Dr. Weitbrecht.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 45. [3] P. 648.

[4] *Apologetics*, p. 463. See also *Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol i. 340.

[5] *Death of Christ*, p. 68. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

[7] *Expansion of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 49.

Christ Himself. I do not mean that the history proves the reality of such a Commission as Matthew records, nor that without it the history would be inexplicable, but that the history is of such a kind as to lend additional credibility to the Gospel record. There is a further point to be kept in mind. Racially and religiously the Jews are the most persistently exclusive people the world has ever known. And when we remember that at first, as we have seen, that exclusiveness was sanctioned by Christ Himself, does it not become morally certain that nothing less than the strong impact of Christ's own command could have pushed the disciples out of the shallows of Judaism into the great deep of the world's life? In face of the opposition which met it on every side, how could the missionary idea have gained and kept its feet unless it had been able to plead some sure, clear word of His?

It has, indeed, been suggested that early Christianity owed something of its missionary enthusiasm to the legacy which it took over from contemporary Judaism. That there was an active Jewish propaganda during the period immediately preceding the dawn of Christianity is probably true. In no other way does it seem possible to account for the enormous number of Jews who were scattered throughout the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian era, and whose presence is one of the proofs of that preparation in history for Christ concerning which so much has been written. It may be an echo of that fervent time which has reached us in our Lord's reference to those who compassed sea and land to make one proselyte. But whatever may have been the character or the results of this movement—and we really know very little about it—it is impossible to recognize in it the true forerunner of the Gentile mission. When we remember what has been the history of the Jews, both ancient and modern; when we think of Pharisaism scornfully picking its way through a world of publicans and sinners; when we listen to the shout of execration which greeted St. Paul on the streets of Jerusalem at the mere mention of the the Gentile name—'Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live';[1] and when we remember that still, in this day of missionary societies, the Jew has none, that indeed hardly anything is more unthinkable than that the wealthy Jews of London and New York should unite for the conversion of China and Japan to the Hebrew faith—when, I say, we remember these things, it is vain to seek in Judaism for the headwaters of that great stream of missionary activity which flows in an ever widening and deepening channel through all the centuries of Christian history.

[1] Ac 22^{22}.

Hardly less mistaken are those who speak as if the real author of missions were St. Paul. The Church universal is too deeply in the great Apostle's debt to be in any real danger of forgetting him or belittling his work. But when it is suggested that Christianity is mainly the creation of his eager brain and fervent heart, the ordinary reader of the New Testament may be forgiven if he declines to treat the suggestion seriously. He knows too well how St. Paul thought of himself and of his relation to Christ, ever to be under the temptation to set him in the seat of his Master. How, he asks himself, would the Apostle have answered those who sought to do him this strange dishonour? No, St. Paul was an apostle even as the rest, *by the will of Christ.*

This, then, is the conclusion to which our brief discussion has led us: the source of Christian missions is to be found not in St. Paul, still less in the activities of contemporary Judaism, but in the declared will and purpose of Christ Himself. True, the sayings in which these find expression are comparatively few, and even these few may not have reached us in the precise form in which they fell from our Lord's lips. There is, nevertheless, good reason for the belief, which the Church has always held, that it was from Christ Himself that she received the charge to make disciples of all the nations.

II.

I can well believe that some may have listened thus far with a chilling sense of disappointment. 'What!' they will ask, 'is this all? A meagre handful of texts snatched from the strife of contending schools—is this all that the Gospels can contribute to the sacred cause of missions? How can we fight the missionary battle with weapons of no tougher steel than these? How can we kindle the missionary fire with only this scanty heap of fuel?' So not unnaturally the question may be asked. And certain it is, doubtful disputations about texts, inevitable as they may be, carry us but a very little way on our road. It is not in

an atmosphere of debate, where argument must be weighed against argument, and the balance of probability struck, that the great constraints are felt which make the missionary. But the truth is, the New Testament argument for missions is a far bigger thing than many of us have ever realized. We have so pinned our faith to a few over-worked texts that if some one threaten to take these from us it seems as if the whole case for missions had gone up in smoke. There is, indeed, good reason, as I have been trying to show, why we should still hold fast to our texts. But do not let us speak as if these were our sole, or even our main, missionary warrant. For my part I cannot pretend to be sorry, rather I rejoice, that our modern methods of Biblical study are compelling us—and that not merely in the matter of missions—no longer to put our trust in texts, but to seek our knowledge of the Divine purpose over the broad spaces and larger areas of Divine revelation. For the moment we abandon our old microscopic methods of Bible study, or, let me rather say, when we supplement them by the study of the Bible as a whole we begin to see that our so-called proof-texts are scarcely so much as the fringe of the great missionary argument. As Dr. Horton says, 'It is not that here and there are missionary texts, injunctions, or suggestions, and that a careful student might painfully extract from certain proof-texts a defence of missionary effort; but it is that the whole book is a clear, ringing, and everlasting missionary injunction.'[1] So that even if—though I do not think it at all likely—Harnack and his friends should turn out to be right, and we should have to surrender the few verses in which Jesus anticipates the world-wide preaching of His gospel; nay, even if we were driven to admit that the Great Commission itself is rather the reflection of the mind of the Church than the direct command of Christ, the missionary application would still press with unweakened force on all who bear the Christian name. This is the point which it will be the aim of the second part of this paper to make good. We are committed to the missionary enterprise by the very nature of the truth we possess. Because Christianity is what it is, because Christ is what He is, we cannot keep Him or it to ourselves alone. In this sense Harnack is right; it was 'in the nature of things' that the disciples of Christ should preach Him and His gospel with the utmost ardour. Even if Jesus never in so many words uttered the Great Commission, it is implied in all He said and did and was. Call it, if you will, the Church's inference rather than the Lord's command, yet it is an inference which only disloyalty could fail to draw; for the very make of the gospel declares that it is as much for everybody as it is for anybody.

[1] *The Bible a Missionary Book*, p. 181.

Thanks to recent Biblical scholarship, we are now able to see in the very *language* of the New Testament a symbol of the universality of its message. As late as but yesterday our scholars have been in the habit of treating the Greek of the New Testament as essentially a language by itself. Every one knew, of course, that it differed widely from the Greek of the older classical period, whether Doric, Æolic, Iolic, or Attic. It was equally clear that it could not be identified with the literary Greek which was in common use throughout the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian era, and in which all the early dialects had been merged. There seemed no escape from the conclusion therefore, which also fitted in readily with certain dogmatic prepossessions, that the language of the New Testament formed a class by itself; it was 'the language of the Holy Ghost,' unprofaned by common use, and to be distinguished from all other Greek, as 'Biblical' or 'New Testament' Greek. Within the last few years, however,—since the publication of the Revised Version of the New Testament—two facts have been brought to light by the industry and genius of scholars which have entirely changed the whole situation. In the first place, mainly through the unearthing and deciphering of a vast mass of papyri—'wills, official reports, private letters, petitions, accounts, and other trivial survivals'—discovered in the rubbish heaps of ancient Egypt, we have been permitted to see for the first time the popular colloquial form of the Greek of our Lord's day. As in the literature of the period we learn what the language had become in the hands of the cultured and literary classes, so here, in the buried papyri, we have it fresh from the lips of the common people, in the ordinary intercourse of daily life. And now comes the surprising and illuminating discovery, due in large measure to the brilliant labours of A. Deissmann and J. H. Moulton,—and this is the second fact to which I refer,—that it is in this same vernacular of daily life that our New Testament itself is written.

Hundreds of words, hitherto assumed to be purely Biblical, the half-technical terms of the new religion, minted afresh, if not actually coined, to serve its purpose, are now seen to be in reality 'normal first century spoken Greek.' We can assert with assurance, says Dr. Moulton, that 'the papyri have finally destroyed the figment of a New Testament Greek which in any material respect differs from that spoken by ordinary people in daily life throughout the Roman world.' In a word, there is no such thing as 'Biblical' Greek. 'The language of the Holy Ghost' is the language of common life. The New Testament is the book of the people, written in the language of the people, and to the people everywhere we must give it, or the very dictionary and grammar will cry out against us.[1]

All this is very interesting, and as a symbol of the universality of the gospel, it is full of suggestion. But we shall need to go much deeper than language if we are to discover in the gospel itself the missionary warrant of which we are in quest. Let us glance for a moment then, first at the teaching of Christ, and then at Christ Himself.

1. And at once we are confronted with a conception of Christ's teaching and its significance which, if it be accepted, will make short work of our whole argument. According to a certain school of recent New Testament interpreters, the central determining idea of Christ's whole life and ministry was eschatology. In other words, Christ taught that God's Kingdom was coming, that it was coming soon, that the Son of Man Himself was about to appear in the clouds of heaven and usher in the eternal reign of righteousness. Such, it is said, was Christ's expectation, and His ethical teaching must be construed in the light of it. If the end of all things were at hand, obviously man's great concern was to make ready for it; he must sit loose to all human joys and prepare himself for the impending change. Hence, we are told, the morality of the gospel is not final and absolute, a morality for all men, under all circumstances. It is rather of the nature of what the Germans call 'interim ethics'—a morality suited to the attitude of those who are awaiting a great and immediate crisis. Christ's teaching concerning His Second Coming cannot, of course, be discussed now; it presents, as every one knows, one of the thorniest problems in the whole field of New Testament interpretation; but this at least may be said: whatever Jesus may have believed about the future, it is too late in the day to suggest that His moral teaching is only of the nature of a temporary expedient to tide over a brief time of waiting before the end. For centuries the best and wisest men in the civilized world have gone to that teaching for their loftiest ideals of duty; they have found in it the sanction and inspiration of their noblest efforts; and it really will not do now for some one to come forward and tell us that, after all, we have been deceiving ourselves, and that the morality of the Gospels is simply a string of temporary precepts which owe their origin to a mistaken idea of Jesus. Whatever men may think about Christ, they know that in Him they have found the nearest approach to the Absolute in morals that this world has to offer.

And it is this quality of absoluteness, this timeless, eternal element in Christ's teaching, which constitutes for all who receive it the obligation to make it known. If its value were relative only, if it were of worth to one, but not to another, if it could appeal to the West, but were powerless to touch the East, the case would be different; but since Christ's words have proved themselves 'the living contemporaries of every age,' every age has a right to them; because they are suited to all, they belong to all, and to withhold them from any is to withhold from them a part of their natural human birthright. Take, for example, Christ's teaching concerning the Divine Fatherhood. If that is true at all, it is universally true, and therefore it ought to be universally made known. The missionary obligation does not depend on whether or not there is attached to the truth an explicit word of command, 'Go tell it to all men'; it is inherent in the truth itself, and wherever it is worthily realized it creates its own missionaries:

> I say to thee do thou repeat
> To the first man thou mayest meet
> In lane, highway, or open street—
>
> That he and we and all men move
> Under a canopy of love
> As broad as the blue sky above.

That is the natural logic of the matter, and I cannot get past so much as the first word of the Lord's Prayer without being reminded of it: 'When ye pray, say,' not 'Father' simply, still less 'my Father,

[1] See J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, chap. i.

but 'our Father.' The fraternal consciousness is bound up with, it is a part of the filial consciousness, and he only has entered into the spirit of sonship who is eager to share with all his brethren the gifts of the Father's love.

But there is no time to speak of particular doctrines; let me emphasize again the timeless element in Christ's teaching. It is identified with none of those things which in their very nature grow old and pass with the passing years: 'It has no laboured law or exacting code, no stereotyped system or ecclesiastical institutions, no ceremonial, or priest, or temple.'[1] Christ's precepts are not provincial edicts, but imperial laws meant to govern the whole world of moral agency. His words of grace are as universal as the sunshine and the air. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away,' He said, 'but my words shall not pass away.' It was an astounding thing to say; if it were not that long familiarity has dulled our minds to the wonder of it, its boldness would take our breath away; but what is still more astonishing, the saying has come true—Christ's words have not passed away, nor can we conceive that they ever will. When will the Lord's Prayer be out of date? Different churches have their different forms of prayer, and once in a while they pass under the hand of the reviser. Even in the Psalter there are things that make us wince sometimes when we hear them in church. But no individual Church can claim the Lord's Prayer; it belongs to us all, and he would be a bold man indeed who should propose to lay revising hands on it. Can we so much as imagine a time when men will not need, or will not wish to hear, the beatitudes of the Mount or the Parable of the Good Samaritan? It is not simply that Christ was, as we say, 'in advance of His time'; many great teachers have been that, and yet, in the end, they have been left behind, and their words forgotten; rather it is that with Him the question of time hardly enters into the reckoning at all—'you cannot date the mind of Christ'—and it is this quality of timelessness which, by detaching His teaching from any particular age, has made it the possession of all the ages. And, again I say, all this involves the missionary idea. It is sheer perversity that can find the missionary 'marching orders' only in a single verse of St. Matthew's Gospel; they are writ large on every page of the New Testament. If we have we owe; we owe because we have; we owe to every man who has not. Discipleship to such a faith commits us to apostleship.

[1] *The Bible a Missionary Book*, p. 62.

2. From the teaching of Christ let us turn to Christ Himself. And, again, we note the universal and eternal in what He was no less than in what He taught. The local and the temporary are there, as indeed they must be, since Christ was born of a Jewish mother. But these things are not He, nor do they explain Him. We may know everything about the Jews and Palestine nineteen hundred years ago, and yet we may be hardly one step nearer understanding Him. The methods of the modern literary realist are not without their value, but not to them does the secret of Jesus reveal itself. This is what some of us in our study of the background of the sacred story are forgetting. Little by little the artist and the traveller, the historian and the scholar, are reconstructing for us the life of that far-off day, until we seem to know Jesus—the dress He wore, the language He spoke, the tools He used, the home He dwelt in—as we know a man of our own city. The landscape of Palestine, its hills and rivers, its towns and villages, its flowers and trees, are as familiar to us as those of our native land. And all this, of course, has its uses, but it has also its perils: we may lose the universal in the local, the Son of God in the Syrian prophet, the Lord of glory in the Man of Nazareth. 'Local colouring' is not to be despised, but unless besides we get the far vistas and wide horizons of the Gospels, we have not seen the true Jesus. He is no mere son of Abraham, He is the Son of Man, the universal Man.

Mark the perfect symmetry of His character. We pick out the characteristics of other men; who can name the characteristics of Jesus? All types of excellence meet in Him. We speak of the manliness of Christ; we are equally true to the facts if we speak of His womanliness. He is as strong as He is gentle; as brave as He is tender. The active and the contemplative may each find in Him their ideal. 'Lay emphasis on either side, and there is something in the Gospels to which you do injustice.'[1]

Mark the completeness of His sympathies. General Booth, it is said, in the earlier days of 'The Army' confessed that he was forced to make a choice; no man's arms are long enough, he said,

[1] See Johnston Ross's *Universality of Jesus*, p. 32.

to reach out to give a hand to the rich and to the people of the depths. Probably he was right; but Christ is confined to no class, and is cut off from none. Some one has remarked that Shakespeare, with all his myriad-mindedness, never seems to have entered into the mind of a little child; there are no real children in his plays, only grown-up men and women trying to talk like children. But who ever opened the Gospel page only to turn away with the feeling: 'This man does not understand me; my life lies beyond the reach of His sympathy'?

> He took the suffering human race,
> He read each wound, each weakness clear,
> And struck his finger on the place,
> And said, *Thou ailest here and here.*

We of the English-speaking world sometimes speak of Christ as if He belonged, if not to the Anglo-Saxon people, at least to the Western world. But He belongs to none save as He belongs to all; He is of the race, 'the one true cosmopolitan'; and when the East sees Him as we see Him, the East will claim Him for its own as justly as we claim Him ours. The East will not want our theology; but that is a small matter. When it has seen Christ it may be trusted to make its own.

> East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet—

so in the street we hear men say:

> 'But Christ is Christ, and rest is rest,
> And love true love must greet.
> In East and West hearts crave for rest;
> And so the twain *shall* meet,
> —The East still East, the West still West—
> At Love's nail-pierced feet.'

In all that has been urged in this paper concerning the universality of Christ and His teaching the appeal throughout has been to the Gospel records. But let it not be forgotten that this claim comes to us to-day interpreted and illuminated by the confirmation of the centuries. This is no untested theory that we are putting forward. The claim we make for Christ, stupendous as it is, has been vindicated in the world's great judgment hall. 'The Christian religion, born in Judea, formulated in Greece, organized in Rome, propagated by Teuton and Frank,' is yet 'neither Jewish, Greek, Roman, nor Saxon'; it has 'acclimatized itself in all lands.' Is there anything in human history which suggests even a faint comparison with the simple tale of facts furnished by the great British and Foreign Bible Society? 'Take any book ever written, the very flower of literature and the supremest effort of human thought, translate it into four hundred and twelve languages, from Sanskrit down to the rudest jargon of savages, and scatter it broadcast over the world. When that is done, and the books have sold everywhere and brought civilization and humanity wherever they have gone,'[1] then, but not till then, you will have a parallel to what has been wrought by the four tiny tracts which tell the story of the life of Christ.

What an impulse lies in all this for our modern missionary effort! Contrast our position to-day with that of the disciples at the beginning of the Christian era. They were as hardy pioneers voyaging through strange seas alone. They knew, indeed, what Christ had been and was to them, but in a sense theirs was a solitary faith; they were making an untried experiment, and when their hearts failed them through fear, there was no long history—that best cordial for drooping spirits—to tell them they were right. We envy them sometimes their nearness to the earthly life of Jesus, but had such a thing been possible, might they not rather have envied us our deep sense of comradeship with the past, our knowledge of what Christianity has proved itself to be over the broad fields of the world's life? We have, as they had, the will of Christ explicit in one great charge, implicit in all He said and did; we have also, what they could not have, the confirmation of the centuries. It is no doubtful venture on which we are bidden to embark. Not Scripture only, but Scripture interpreted and made luminous by history, calls us to the missionary task. On our bowed heads an awful past has laid its consecrating hands.

> To doubt would be disloyalty,
> To falter would be sin.

[1] J. H. Moulton, *Hibbert Journal*, vii. 765.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM CXIX. 105.

'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet,
And light unto my path.'

1. How can a word be a lamp? Take this familiar story from English history, as told by Dr. Alexander Macleod:—

Seven hundred years ago, all Europe was sending soldiers to Jerusalem to fight for the Saviour's grave. The lords of Jerusalem at that time were fierce Saracens, who did not believe in Jesus. And the people of Europe said: 'Why should unbelievers like these be lords of the place where our Saviour lay?' Army after army went from England, France, and Germany. And sometimes they won, and sometimes they lost. And when it was their lot to lose, they were seized, made prisoners, and sold as slaves.

It happened in one of the battles that a young Englishman, named Gilbert à Becket, was taken prisoner and sold as a slave. He was sold to a rich and princely Saracen, who set him to work in his garden. And there, as she took her daily walks in the garden, the daughter of his master saw him. And when she looked at his sad but beautiful face, and remembered that he was a slave, first she wept for him, and then she loved him; and then she resolved to help him to escape. So one night she procured a little ship, and had it waiting near the shore, and she opened the door of à Becket's prison, and gave him money, and said to him, 'Go back to England.'

Now Gilbert had seen her love and returned it. And when he was going away he said to her, 'You too will one day escape, and find your way to London, and there I will make you my wife.' And then he kissed her, and blessed her, and went out free. And he reached the little ship and found his way to England. But the Saracen maid remained in the East.

Many a night she looked towards the sea, along the very path he went, and thought of him, and longed for him, and wept. She longed to be at his side. But how was she to escape from home? How could she cross the seas? How could she ever hope to arrive in England? She could not speak the English speech. The only word she knew was 'London, à Becket.' À Becket had taught her this much in the garden.

At last she could remain no longer in the East. She would go to the Christian land, and be a Christian, and the wife of Gilbert à Becket. So one day she left her home, and went to the sea, and to the English ships, and as she went she said, 'London, à Becket.'

She uttered this word, and rough sailors made room for her in their ships. 'London, à Becket,' she said, and ships hauled up their anchors, and spread their sails, and carried her through stormy seas. 'London, à Becket!' It was all she said, all she could say, but it went before her like a light, and made a path for her over the pathless deep; and she followed it until her eye caught sight of the white cliffs of England, and her feet touched the sandy beach, and she was in the land of him she loved.

She had far miles still to travel to reach London. And these were the old times when there were no railways, no coaches, not even roads. Old bad times, when robbers lived in dusky woods, and bad men watched from grim stone castles, that they might rob and kill the lonely travellers. But she went onwards. 'London,' she said, 'London, à Becket.' London was many miles away; but that word opened up a way to her, went before her, was coach and road and guide to her. It was a lamp to her feet. She uttered it as she was setting out every morning, and peasants tending their cattle on the heath pointed in the direction where London lay. The lamp went before her over hills and fields, and woods and streams, and brought her at last to the gates of London town.

'London, à Becket,' she said, as she passed on through the streets. From street to street went this Eastern lady, from street to street, and from house to house, and still as she went she said, 'London, à Becket.' Crowds gathered about her in the streets, and some wondered, and some mocked, and some had pity; but she made her appeal to the very crowds as she said, 'London, à Becket.' The word was caught up by those who heard it, and passed from lip to lip, and from street to street, until it filled the town, and searched out for her à Becket's house and brought her to his door. And then her long toil was ended. À Becket heard the well-known voice, and leaped and ran, and folded her to his bosom, and took her into his house, and made her his wife, and loved her with all his love. His word had been a lamp to her feet, and brought her to his side. She became the mother of the famous Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury.

2. The word spoken of in the text is the word of God, 'Thy word.' And on the lips of the Psalmist who wrote the 119th Psalm it means the Law of Moses.

The 119th Psalm, says Liddon, is a hymn of one hundred and seventy-six verses in praise of the Mosaic Law, which, whether as God's Law, or His statutes, or His commandments, or His testimonies, or His precepts, or His ceremonies, or His truth, or His way, or His righteousness, is referred to in every single verse of it except two. There is no other Psalm like it, for its varied power of expressing all that is deepest and most affectionate in the human soul when in communion with God as revealed to us in His Word and Will; and, like many of the most beautiful things in the moral and spiritual world, this Psalm is the product of sorrow.

There is not much reason for doubting that it was written quite at the close of the Jewish Captivity in Babylon by some pious Jew, who had felt all the unspeakable bitterness of the Exile; the insults and persecution of the heathen; the shame, the loss of heart, the 'trouble above measure,' which that compulsory sojourn, in the centre of debased heathendom, must have meant for him. The writer was a man for whom sorrow did its intended work, by throwing him back upon God, His ways, and His will; and so in this trouble, when all was dark around, and hope was still dim and distant, and the heathen insolent and oppressive, and the temptations to religious laxity or apostasy not few nor slight, he still could say, 'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and light unto my path.'

3. But this witness of the captive Jew who wrote the Psalm, thinking only of the Mosaic Law, has been echoed again and again by Christians, with reference to the whole Bible of the Old and New Testaments, and in a deeper sense. They have found this book a lamp unto their feet, and light unto their path. Not, however, without reading; not without study. Now there are various ways of studying the Bible.

(1) There is the method of science. We try to reproduce the circumstances of the writer of this 119th Psalm, and his meaning when he spoke of the sacred writings as a lamp to his feet, and a light to his path. Who was he? when, and where did he write? What were the books he spoke of? and in what sense did they guide him on his way through the world? The many-sidedness of the Bible; its immense resources; the great diversity of its contents and character; its relations with ages so widely apart as are the age of Moses and the age of St. Paul; its vast stores of purely antiquarian lore; its intimate bearing upon the histories of great peoples in antiquity, of which independently we know not a little, such as the Egyptians and the Assyrians; the splendour and the pathos of its sublimer poetry;—all these bristle with interest for an educated man, whether he be a good man or not. The Bible is a storehouse of literary beauties, of historical problems; of materials for refined scholarship and the scientific treatment of language; of different aspects of social theories or of the philosophy of life. A man may easily occupy himself with one of these subjects for a whole lifetime and never approach the one subject which makes the Bible what it is. And, indeed, much of the modern literature about the Bible is no more distinctly related to religion than if it had been written about Homer, or Herodotus, or Shakespeare, or Gibbon. It deals only with those elements of the Bible which the Bible has in common with other and purely human literature; it treats the Bible as literature simply, and not as the vehicle of something which distinguishes it altogether from all merely human books.

(2) There is also the method of philosophy. The Bible may be read for the purpose of constructing a philosophy of God's dealings with man. The great problem of the world is man's existence and destiny—what we are, and whither we are tending, and what is the mystery of this world. Now in constructing this philosophy, which is in fact a theology and a scheme of salvation, the Bible has always been, and always will be, of primary importance. During the ages of the great writers of the Christian Church the Bible was used as the quarry out of which a systematic theology was to be constructed; it was a collection of texts. Little attention comparatively was paid to the original and historical meaning of the passages, or to the varying circumstances under which they were written; but systems were constructed — physical, ecclesiastical, theological — which we now see to have been scarcely even outlined or shadowed in the Bible itself; and these were formulated with a precision obtained only by the sacrifice of large portions of the Bible, and by the absence of all historical perspective. The historical side of the Bible was lost sight of; Augustine, for example, says that whatever narrative has no immediate bearing on the rules of life must be treated as figurative. The question became not what the Bible meant, but what it might be made to mean, and such a question has plainly an infinite number of answers. The Bible became a storehouse to which each party in a controversy went for his weapons.

(3) There is still another method of studying the Bible. It is the method of devotion. And it is this method that the Psalmist uses. When we employ the devotional method we read a passage privately, by ourselves, and ask ourselves, 'In what sense is this meant for me? What can I learn from it?' This reading acts not only on the intelligence, but also on the spiritual life, and for

this it is essential. It adds to our knowledge, but it also adds to our goodness, and calmness, and wisdom; it does not add to the length and width, one may say, of our knowledge, as it adds to its height and depth. No other reading will take the place of this. In no other way can we learn the value of the Bible.

You may rightly read other books for devotional purposes. It is well to read such books as *The Imitation of Christ*, *The Christian Year*, and other similar devotional books in prose and verse. But remember that these books all get their inspiration from the Bible: they shine by reflected light. The light that they shine by is none other than that Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. It is Christ in the Gospels that alone shines like the sun by His own light. Here is the source of all the inspiration of saint and poet that moves us heavenward. We then ought to try to get our inspiration at first hand, not at second hand. Let us bring our souls into as close contact as possible with nature and with Christ, the two channels by which God speaks to man. 'The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork,' is the voice that speaks of one channel. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father,' is the voice that speaks of the other.[1]

We do not find all portions of the Bible equally good for devotional reading. We choose our favourite books—the Psalms, or the Gospels, or the Epistles, and read them again and again, taking some daily portion for our study, and by no means caring to read the whole of the Bible for this purpose. No doubt every line of the Bible has some bearing on man's future destiny; but in some cases this bearing is direct and obvious, in others it is indirect, and perceived only after long reflexion. For instance, St. Paul desires Timothy to bring with him from Ephesus to Rome the cloak which was left at Troas, 'and the books, but especially the parchments.' This verse has its use and interest. It shows the spirit in which service may be asked and rendered by fellow-labourers in the cause of Christ; it illustrates the use of literature as an agent in the propagation of the Faith. But no one would compare it, in point of direct religious or moral teaching, with such words of the same Apostle as 'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ'; or, 'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners'; or, 'Christ in you, the hope of glory.'

What is wanted is a sense of proportion; a perception of the relative importance of things; of the subordination in which the earthly and the human must always stand to the spiritual and the Divine. Thus the life of David is not without high political interest. But how insignificant is this interest when we compare it with David's language and conduct as a great penitent! The case is parallel to that of the relation which the externals of worship bear to its essential spirit and life. The architecture of churches, the beauty and character of music, the order and accuracy of ceremonial,—these things are not without their value, since man is led, by his imagination and his ear and his sense of beauty, towards the frontier of the invisible world. But the essential thing in worship is the communion of the living soul with its Maker and Redeemer. And a man who should imagine himself a true worshipper of Christ because he was well versed in sacred music, or in the details of ritual, would exactly correspond to a man who should think himself a true student of Scripture merely because he was a keen Biblical archæologist, or a good Hebrew scholar, or an authority on the critical questions which have been raised as to the date and authorship of the Gospels.

[1] J. M. Wilson.

4. The word of God, says the Psalmist, is a lamp to the feet and light to the path. Here, as we often find in Hebrew poetry, the parallelism or recurrence of the same thought, or of one like it, in the two members of a verse, is more than a simple repetition. The Word of God is a lamp or lantern to the feet by night. It is light, as that of the sun, by day. It makes provision for the whole of life; it is the secret of life's true sunshine; it is the guide when all around is dark. It thus throws light on 'the path' and 'the feet'; on the true course which thought and conduct should follow, and on the efforts which are necessary in order to do so. With the Word of God at hand, we should be in no doubt about the greatest practical question which man has to deal with; the true road to everlasting happiness in another life.

Much of the dislike felt towards the Revised Version is connected with the number of 'trivial changes.' No one else, however, has paid so heavy a price for changes of association as have we who were Revisers. And at least one generation must elapse before this disadvantage is overcome. Nevertheless, changes which are called 'trivial,' besides being justified as part of a system, are often intentionally presented in this unobtrusive form, so as to minimize the disagreeable consequences. Take two examples

of different kinds. '*Meal*-offering' stands instead of '*meat*-offering,' that is, the bloodless offering in the Levitical law. 'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, *and light* unto my path,' is instead of the tautological and inaccurate '*a light*.' Already it is felt by multitudes that a parallel Bible, honestly studied, is one of the best commentaries possible.[1]

I.

A Lamp to the Feet.

1. The Word of God is *a traveller's lamp*. An American Bible-reader tells us that, going two miles to read to a company, and at the close being about to return through a narrow path in the woods where paths diverged, he was provided with a torch of light wood or pitch pine. He objected that it was too small, weighing not over half a pound. 'It will light you home,' answered the host. And to all objections the same answer came, 'It will light you home.' Thus, if the Bible were taken, it would be found sufficient to light home. Some may object to this part of the Bible, and others to another part; but the answer of the Bible to all objectors is, 'It will light you home.'

An incident is told in Captain McClintock's narrative: the search in the Arctic Seas for Sir John Franklin and his brave men. After many difficulties and dangers, these explorers at last came upon a boat, containing some bleached skeletons of Englishmen. A few silver spoons and forks with name and crest upon them were also discovered; which at once told the sad truth. But to me the most touching and impressive things they beheld were two guns, double-barrelled. One of the barrels was loaded. The guns were in full cock, resting over each side of the boat ready to be fired. They had been in that position for twelve years. Beside them, and scattered in the boat were *lanterns*. What sort of lanterns? I do not mean lamps to guide them and light them in the Arctic seas and among Arctic icebergs. But I mean *Bibles*. Yes, Bibles along with Testaments, Prayer-books, and books of devotion. These, too, were marked and underlined, as if they had been carefully read. A friend of mine told me that he had been at the United Service Museum, shortly after these relics of the Franklin expedition were collected, that he had seen the marked Bibles, and underscored verses: the guns too, just as they were found, pointing upwards from the boats. He mentioned being specially struck with the underlined words in Psalm 139: 'Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.'[2]

[1] Principal G. C. M. Douglas, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, iii. 494.

[2] J. R. Macduff.

2. It is *a signal lamp*. God's Word points out the places of moral danger and shows the right way. This is especially observable in the things that were written aforetime. In this aspect the biographies are remarkable. The things written about the errors of Old Testament worthies, and read in our churches, are written and read for our learning, that we may avoid their faults. On the lamp is written the words, 'Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall.' Too many modern biographies give unreal characters. Scriptural biographies are real pictures. The men and women are human in their frailties at least. Let us attend, then, to the signal lights which the Scriptures give.

One night the train stopped at a small station over an hour. One man grew impatient, and called to the conductor, 'Why don't you go on?' 'Do you see that red light ahead?' said the conductor; 'that means danger. I dare not pass that; if I did there would be disaster.'

3. It is *a night lamp*. There is no sorrow which it cannot soothe; no bereavement which it cannot comfort. Sometimes the night of affliction is around us, but what a blessed and subdued light the Bible then becomes for languid eyes.

In the Indian Mutiny of 1857, a number of fathers, mothers, and children were shut up within the walls of a fort which has a terrible memory. Every day, every hour, they were expecting a fearful end at the hands of their foes. It was a sudden gleam from God's own Lantern which cheered them as nothing else could have done. What do I mean by this? A native servant who had remained faithful, had stolen, one night, secretly into the citadel, in order to try and fetch some medicine for his sick master. He managed to procure it, and returned with the drugs, wrapped up in a piece of waste paper. What did this paper turn out to be? It was a portion of a leaf of God's Holy Word. It was, as I have called it, a gleam from the Divine lamp of God. Listen to what these terror-stricken sufferers read with tearful, grateful eyes: 'I, even I, am he that comforteth you: who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass; and forgettest the Lord thy maker, that hath stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth; and hast feared continually every day, because of the fury of the oppressor, as if he were ready to destroy? and where is the fury of the oppressor? The captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed, and that he should not die in the pit, nor that his bread should fail. But I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea, whose waves roared: The Lord of hosts is his name. And I have put my words in thy mouth, and I have covered thee in the shadow of mine hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of

the earth, and say unto Zion, Thou art my people' (Is 51^{12-16}). Need I tell you that these precious thoughts and words contained in that scrap of paper—these flashes from the heavenly lantern—brought to the affrighted captives a hope and peace which nothing else could, into the darkness of their despair. They thanked God and took courage. The day *did* come when they found He was true to His word; and when some of them, at least, were spared joyfully to say: 'O give thanks unto the Lord; for he is good: for his mercy endureth for ever. Let the redeemed of the Lord say so, whom he hath redeemed from the hand of the enemy. . . . He brought them out of darkness and the shadow of death, and brake their bands in sunder.'[1]

II.

Light to the Path.

(1) Light stands for *Knowledge*. There was a tired traveller, who came, on a winter day, to a hill. He did not notice on the hillside a glassy slide; and, slipping, he rolled to the bottom. He fell against a door, which opened, and let him fall into a dungeon. There was one who saw what had happened—a knight in shining armour. Stepping to the now closed dungeon door, he touched it with the point of his sword, and called out the man. Then he guided him back up the hill, lifted him on to a tableland, and sent him rejoicing on his way. The dungeon was Ignorance, the knight was Instruction, and the tableland was Knowledge.[2]

In the course of pastoral visitation I called on a man, some eighty years of age. Owing to an accident some years before, he had lost the sight of an eye, with the result that the other eye became affected. I was not aware of the fact. During the course of my visitation I asked him, among other things, if he read the Word, when I got the following answer: 'Well, sir, I may say I do not read it much for this reason, the sight of my good eye is not so good as it used to be. I find when I look at print the sight becomes dull, and the eye fills with water and I seem to be looking through a mist, and the page is blurred and I cannot make it out. And she (referring to his wife who was sitting near) can't read, and so I do not read much,' and then he added these significant words: '*But I have so much by me as does me.*' And then he began to talk about the Word—the Psalms and Job coming in for special attention, his grasp of the latter being marvellous, so accurate, so intimate was he with its contents and so deeply experienced in the deep things of suffering and sorrow. He himself had trodden the Valley of the Shadow more than once. His testimony to the last was bright and beautiful and not without results, for his wife came to a saving knowledge of the truth, and to-day is a happy Christian entering on her eighty-fourth year.

(2) Light stands for *Godliness*. A little while ago, I heard one of our most useful missionaries tell of how he saw a Maori chief, Tamati, starting back one day from the Table of the Lord, and for a while refusing to kneel beside his brethren there, because, as he afterwards said, he had seen for the first time kneeling there a once heathen chief, who in the days of their former life had killed his father and drunk his blood. 'I had sworn by the gods,' he said, 'that if ever I met that chief I would deal with him as he had dealt with my dead father, and now that I saw him for the first time my whole soul rose in fury against him. And as I stood on one side nursing my wrath, the words fell on my ears again and again, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee; the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee"; and at last,' he added, 'His presence filled my soul, and His peace crept into my heart again, and I asked myself, If He suffered all this for me, cannot I even forgive the man who slew my father, and drank his blood?'[3]

Charles Dickens wrote to his son, when the latter was about to begin undergraduate life at Cambridge University: 'I most strongly and affectionately impress upon you the priceless value of the New Testament, and the study of that book as the one unfailing guide in life. Deeply respecting it, and bowing down before the character of our Saviour, as separated from the vague constructions and inventions of men, you cannot go far wrong, and will always preserve at heart a true spirit of veneration and humility. These things have stood by me all through my life, and remember that I tried to render the New Testament intelligible to you, and lovable by you, when you were a mere baby.'[4]

(3) Light stands for *Social Service*. The following incident was related by Canon Bardsley, father of the Bishop of Carlisle:

'I was travelling third class,' said the canon, 'with some working-men as my companions. Judging of my calling by my dress, I suppose they thought they would have some fun out of the old parson, so they began to talk to each other, but *at* me. I remained silent whilst they aired their views about the uselessness of church-going and the hypocrisy of many who practised it. Long prayers, long faces, and cant were the special marks of people who called themselves religious, according to their ideas. They were only like a great many others who would fain persuade themselves they are right in trying to live without God, and who profess to despise His Word.

'At last,' continued the canon, 'I got my chance. One of the men said, "I'm with you, mates. If we just do as we'd like to be done by in this world, we don't want any better religion than that."

'The speaker looked me straight in the face and gave a self-satisfied nod, as if to say, "The parson can't go against that."

[1] J. R. Macduff. [2] S. P. Bevan. [3] Bishop Crozier. [4] Forster, *Life of Dickens*.

'I smiled and replied, "That is excellent teaching, my friend. Where did you get it?"

'"Where! Why, everybody knows the old saying, 'Do as you would be done by.' If it is good, what does it matter where it came from at first?"

'"It matters a good deal to me, my friend, for it is in that old Book you have been running down that we first find the text: 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' There are a few more sayings of the same sort in that Book—all old-fashioned ones, such as, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself': 'Love worketh no ill to his neighbour.' But the old Book goes right on, and says, 'If ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? Love ye your enemies; do good and lend, hoping for nothing again'; and 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink,' and so on."

'The men looked at each other as much as to say, "He has us there. He has met us on our own ground." My stopping-place was near, but I had time to offer a few words of advice as to the use and abuse of the Bible, and we parted good friends.'[1]

[1] Ruth Lamb, *In the Twilight*, 83.

Pîr'îdrî (Ben-Hadad) King of Syria.

By Stephen H. Langdon, M.A., Ph.D., Shillito Reader in Assyriology, Oxford.

In 2 K 8[7-15] has been preserved the Hebrew source of the usurpation of the throne of Damascus by Hazael, who is mentioned thrice in the inscriptions of Salmanassar II., who conducted a campaign against him and drove him into Damascus.[1] In the Hebrew source mentioned above the king who was slain by Hazael appears as Ben-Hadad. Historians have generally supposed that the deposed king of 2 K 8 is identical with Ben-Hadad, king of Syria, of 1 K 20, who warred against Ahab (875–853). In the inscriptions of Salmanassar II. [860–825] he mentions several campaigns against Damascus which preceded those against Hazael of the same city. The first occurred in 854, in which year Salmanassar fought not only against Damascus, but against a coalition composed of Irḫuleni of Hamath, Ahab of Israel, $^{\text{iu}}$*IM-idri* of Damascus, and others. This same $^{\text{iu}}$*IM-id-ri* is named in the inscriptions of Salmanassar as king of Damascus in the campaigns of 850,[2] 849, and 846.

In the Hebrew sources, Ben-Hadad, בֶּן־הֲדַד, evidently corresponds to the Assyrian $^{\text{iu}}$*IM-id-ri*, and various theories have arisen to account for this difficulty. Most recently, Dr. Luckenbill, in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* (April 1911), has attempted to solve the difficulty by supposing that the scribe of 2 K 8 made a mistake and should have written Hadad-ezer, the Hebrew equivalent of $^{\text{iu}}$*IM-id-ri* or Adad-id-ri. He supposes that Ben-Hadad, who appears in 1 K 20 as the foe of Ahab, with whom he then made peace, perished before 854, in which year (or before) Hadad-ezer (not mentioned in Hebrew sources) succeeded to the throne. The accuracy of 2 K 8 is, however, greatly strengthened by the new inscription of Salmanassar inscribed on his statue and published by Messerschmidt[3] in *Keilschrift-Texte aus Assur* (Leipzig, 1911, No. 30). Here it is expressly stated that Hazael, the son of a nobody, seized the throne of $^{\text{iu}}$*IM-id-ri*, and that the latter fled from the country.

The only possible way out of this difficulty is to go back to the interpretation of Winckler and Delitzsch, now held also by Zimmern,[4] and read the Assyrian name as $^{\text{iu}}$*Pir-id-ri*. Great objection to this reading has been raised in various quarters, it being asserted that no reason can be found for the epithet *pir* for Adad, the Aramean thunder-god identified by the Babylonians with their Sumerian deity *IM*, *i.e. immer*>*mer* and *iskur*. Yet the Assyrian syllabar (*C.T.* xxv. 16. 8) has clearly $^{\text{iu}}$*pi-ir* = $^{\text{iu}}$*IM*, and proper names of the early period have been found, namely, $^{\text{iu}}$*pi-ir-abu-šu*,[5] $^{\text{iu}}$*pi-ir-*

[1] In the campaign of 842 B.C. [*R.* iii. 5, No. N6 = Black Obelisk 97–99] and in the campaign of 839 [Obelisk 102–104].

[2] So Salmanassar, Bull Inscr. 87–91, supposed to be a repetition of the campaign of 849, see Ungnad, *Texte und Bilder*, 111.

[3] This accomplished scholar has recently passed away. In him Assyriology has suffered an irreparable loss. He combined modesty and culture with great and accurate scholarship. The writer has composed this short article as a tribute to a lamented colleague.

[4] In his article 'Benhadad,' *Hilprecht Anniversary Volume*, 299–303.

[5] Thureau-Dangin, *Lettres et Contrats*, 74. 33, and 73. 40. Also $^{\text{iu}}$*pi-ir-aštar* (73. 40, 74. 33), a name which appears to include two divinities. See further Ranke, *Personal Names*, 135, $^{\text{iu}}$*pi-ir* in several names, and *V.S.* viii. 48. 15.

abum, etc., which justify the reading. Zimmern and Lidsbarski have made it probable that the name of Hazael's son on the Zakar inscription of Pognon is really ברהדר (*bir-idar*), who appears as Ben-hadad in 2 K. 13.

The Septuagint has, as is well known, *υἱὸς* Ἀδέρ. Ἀδέρ evidently points to the original second element *id-ri* of the Assyrian inscriptions, whereas *Pir*, the divine name, is misunderstood for the Aramaic *bar*, Hebrew *ben*. This is an old view which has been abandoned and recently revived. The new inscription which I transcribe here will perhaps help in the solution of this problem, and perhaps firmly establish *Bir-adar* in place of the extremely doubtful Ben-Hadad.

BERLIN MUSEUM, No. 742.

Translation.

'Salmanassar the great king, the mighty king, king of all the four quarters, the sturdy, the valiant, rival of the princes of the universe, the great kings, son of Asurnazirpal, king of the universe, king of Assyria, son of Tukulti-Ninib, king of the universe, king of Assyria, conqueror of the lands Enzi[ti], Gilzānu, Ḫubuš[kia]. Urartu I smote (?). Their overthrow I brought about. Like fire upon them I came. Aḫuni, son of Adini, together with his gods, the soldiers of his land, and the goods of his house, I seized away for the people of my land. At that time Piridri of the land of *ANŠU-ŠU*, together with twelve kings, his helpers—their overthrow I brought about. 29,000 strong warriors I crushed like chaff (?). The remainder of his soldiers I heaped into the river Orontes. To save their souls they went up. Piridri abandoned his land. Ḫazael the son of a nobody seized the throne. His many soldiers he summoned; to conflict and battle against me he went forth. With him I fought. His overthrow I brought about. The wall of his camp I took from him. To save his soul he went up. Unto Damascus the city of his royalty I followed him.'

Text.

(1) ^{ilu}*Šulmanu-ašaridu šarru rabû šarru dannu*
(2) *šar kul-lat kib-rat arba'i ik-du*
(3) *li-'-ú ša-nin mal-ki^{pl}*
(4) *šá kiš-ša-ti rabûti šarrāni*
(5) *mar Ašur-naṣir-apli šar kiššāti šar ^{mat}Aššur*
(6) *apal Tukulti-Ninib šar kiššāti šar ^{mat}Aššur-ma ka-šid*
(7) ^{mat}*En-zi*[1] ^{mat}*gil-za-a-nu*[2] ^{mat}*Ḫu-bu-uš-*[*ki-a*]
(8) ^{mat}*U-ra-*[*ar ?*]*-tam as-pan* (sic!) [*abikta šunu*]
(9) *aš-kun-ma ki-ma išati*
(10) *eli-šu-nu a-ba-' A-ḫu-ni*
(11) *mar A-di-ni a-di ilāni-šú*
(12) *ṣābê-šu māti-šù*[3] *makkur biti-*[*šù a-*] *su-*[*ḫa-šù*]
(13) *a-na nišê māti-ia* [*i-nu-*] *šu-ma*
(14) ^{ilu}*Pir-id-ri ša ^{mat}ANŠU-ŠÙ*
(15) *a-di* 12 *mal-ki^{pl} ri-ṣi-šu*
(16) *abikta-šu-nu aš-kun-ma* 29,000[4]
(17) *a-li-li mun-taḫ-ḫi-ṣi*
(18) *ú-ni-li ki-ma šu-bi*
(19) *si-ta-at ṣābê-šu-nu a-na*
(20) *nâr A-ra-an-te*[5] (21) *aš-pu-uk*
(22) *a-na* (23) *šu-zu-ub* (24) *napšāti-šu-nu e-li-ú*
(25) ^{ilu}*Pir-id-ri māti-su e-mi-id*[6]
(26) *Ḫa-za-'-ilu mar la ma-ma-na*
(27) *kussa iṣ-bat ṣāḫê-šu ma-'-du*
(28) *id-ka-a a-na e-piš* (29) *ḳabli u taḫazi a-na irti-a it-ba-a*
(30) *it-ti-šu am-daḫ-ḫi-iṣ abikta-šu*
(31) *aš-kun dur uš-ma-ni-šu e-kim-su*[7]
(32) *a-na šu-zu-ub napšāti-šu* (33) *e-li a-di*
(34) ^{ālu}*Di-ma-aš-ḳi âl šarrûti šu ar-di.*

[1] *Sic!* Ordinarily *En-zi-te*, *R.* iii. 8, 45.
[2] Mentioned also Salm. Colossus, 36.
[3] For *ṣābê mātišu*, see Meissner, *Assyr. Grammatik*, p. 31 *m*. This anticipative use of the 3rd sing. pass. in Semitics (common in modern Moroccan Arabic) is found as early as Hammurabi. *B.A.* vi. 5, p. 3, l. 3, and see Brockelmann, *Vergl. Grammatik*, 471 *β*.
[4] Salm. Col. 73 has 25,000.
[5] The Orontes.
[6] For this expression for abdicating a throne, see *R.* v. 2*b*, 81; Jakinlu, king of Arwad, *e-mi-du māti-šu*, quit his land.
[7] Cf. *R.* iii. 5, No. 6, 51.

The Perfect Friendship.

By the Rev. James Strahan, M.A., Edinburgh.

'Ye are my friends . . . I have called you friends.' Jn 15[14. 15].

When Christ says to His disciples, 'No longer do I call you servants,' He is not cancelling the relationship which has hitherto subsisted between Him and them. He is setting aside none of His dignity and authority. 'Ye call me, Teacher, and, Lord (ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὁ κύριος): and ye say well; for so I am' (Jn 13[13]). These titles retain all their force. And the apostles never cease to glory in the fact that He is for ever the Master, and they for ever the servants. 'Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ' (Ro 1[1]). 'Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus' (Ph 1[1]). 'James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ' (Ja 1[1]). And when John was spending his years of exile in the island of Patmos, and there received glimpses of the unseen and eternal world with its conditions, it was revealed to him that the old relationship to Christ is enduring. 'And his servants shall serve him; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be on their foreheads' (Rev 22[4]). We therefore peremptorily dismiss the idea that Christ thinks of rescinding an iota of His lordship.

But what He does say is that lordship is not all. He is about to send His disciples out into the vast world to undertake the greatest task ever entrusted to human beings—the founding of His kingdom on earth. He commissions them to go to humanity, with all its sin, all its culture, all its hoary faiths and superstitions, and to conquer it for Him. And ere He sends them away, He assures them that they go not only as His servants but as His friends. He gives them all the joy and power of this revelation. He wishes their ministry to be for ever irradiated by a Divine friendship.

In this friendship He has necessarily taken the initiative. 'Ye did not choose me, but I chose you.' It is the prerogative of the great to choose their own friends. When King Edward VII. died, the *Graphic* published a gallery of portraits, under which were written the words, 'The friends of the King.' They had not chosen him, but he had chosen them. He had made them the men of his counsel, visited them at their houses, rejoiced with them in their joys, sympathized with them in their sorrows, and to the end of their life they will no doubt count this the greatest honour ever conferred upon them, that they were thought worthy to be 'the king's friends' (cf. 1 K 4[5]). But what is the highest earthly comradeship in comparison with the friendship of Jesus of Nazareth? There is a beautiful tradition in the first book of the Bible, to the effect that God drew near to a shepherd on the plain of Shinar, revealed to him something of His mind and character, and gave him wonderful promises which were received in faith; and in after ages that spiritual pioneer was known to prophets and apostles as 'the friend of God' (אֹהֲבִי, Is 41[8]; φίλος θεοῦ, Ja 2[23]). To this day the Arabs habitually speak of him as 'El Khalîl,' 'The Friend.' This was a title reserved for one who was believed to have been admitted into a peculiarly intimate communion with God.

But a new era dawned when the Son of Man, who had, in the language of modern theology, 'the value of God,' who was, in finer apostolic phraseology, 'the brightness of God's glory and the very image of his substance,' and who came to sojourn among men as 'the Word made flesh,' offered nothing less than a Divine friendship to all His disciples, an offer conditioned only by faith. As He lived and taught in Galilee and Judea, His jealous adversaries pointed at Him the finger of scorn, and said, 'Behold a friend of publicans and sinners' (Lk 7[34]). It is probable that no title indicative of eternal power and glory ever gave Him greater pleasure than this name which was flung at Him as a bitter gibe, for it expressed with perfect accuracy the true end and aim of His life. The 'sinners,' who knew well that the 'righteous' Pharisees were their implacable enemies, quickly learned, as by intuition, that the Prophet of Nazareth was their Friend. His pure life, His holy spirit judged them, but His heart loved them. They knew that He loved the least, the last, the lowest, the most utterly lost of them. His friendship awakened the spiritual instinct which was not dead but only dormant, and in some of them created a manifold faith—in Him,

in themselves, in the redemption of the most broken and wasted lives, in the infinite goodness and patience of God. His friendship meant nothing less than salvation to them, and perfected itself by making them worthy to be His friends. With all the power of God, He redeemed their lives from destruction, He crowned them with loving-kindness and tender mercy. And they never for a moment imagined that they entered the charmed circle of His friends merely of their own accord. They were called to it, they were chosen for it, they were irresistibly drawn into it. The impulse and the inspiration of the new life came to them through the grace of God, incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth.

It was Christ's purpose that His friendship with all His followers should be based upon a perfect mutual understanding. 'I have called you friends,' He said to His disciples, 'for all things that I heard from my Father I have made known unto you.' He makes a clear distinction between two things which are both admirable—service and friendship. He never utters a disparaging word about service. He says elsewhere that it is good and faithful servants who enter into the joy of their lord (Mt $25^{21.23}$). But He plainly indicates that there is something higher than service. There is a nearer and dearer relationship, into which it is the privilege of all His disciples to enter. To this He bids them aspire. A servant is one who receives his instructions at the beginning of the day, is expected to carry them out to the letter, whether he understands their scope and purpose or not. He may or may not have a personal interest in his work, he may or may not sympathize with his master's aims; in either case his obligation is perfect obedience. And Christianity has often been illustrated by the familiar words, 'Their's not to reason why, their's not to make reply.' The soldier's life of service certainly displays the absolute ideal of implicit, unquestioning obedience. But there is something higher even than that. With all reverence the followers of Christ may say, 'Ours *is* to reason why, ours *is* to make reply.' Their Lord Himself so wills it. He is their Teacher as well as their Master, and they know that while they dare not set aside any moral imperative which He addresses to their conscience, a blind, unintelligent submission is the last thing that He desires of them. During His years of familiar intercourse with the Twelve, He listened to a thousand questions and answers. He encouraged them to state all their difficulties and reason everything out. He sought to make His revelation perfectly clear to their minds; He wished their service to be based on an ever-increasing enlightenment. They were students at once of His life and His teaching, to whom He told all His secrets, explained all His purposes, unfolded all His ideals, in so far as they were 'able to bear' the instruction; and at the end He could say to them, 'No longer do I call you servants, but I have called you friends, for *all things* that I heard of my Father I have made known to you.' Our Catholic fellow-Christians are surely much maligned when they are represented as saying that 'ignorance is the mother of devotion.' At any rate the exact opposite of that is the truth—knowledge is the mother of devotion. Let it grow from more to more. Christ wishes every follower of His to consider the facts of Christianity again and again till they become sun-clear to his intelligence, till they beget the fullest persuasion in his own mind. Thus the servant of Christ becomes His friend.

Scarcely any words are adequate to represent the effects of this Divine friendship. It is redeeming, uplifting, purifying, transfiguring. Human friendship at its best has always something redemptive in it. It is related that Charles Kingsley was once asked by Mrs. Browning, 'What is your secret?' Her question meant, 'What is it that explains you, that accounts for all that is highest, noblest, best in you, that makes you the man, the writer, the teacher you are?' He answered very simply and sufficiently, 'I had a friend.' He meant that at the critical time of his career, when life's great decisions were being made, when character was being moulded for better or for worse, God in His good providence gave him a wise and true friend, who constrained him to what was good, and restrained him from what was evil, who in some sense embodied for him the Christian ideal, and drew him upwards to what was pure and holy, so that he ever afterwards felt that that friendship was the determining factor in his personal experience. And Kingsley gives us all, in our choice of friends, a somewhat strange and startling advice. He advises us to choose those of whom we are at first rather afraid, that is, those in whose presence we dare not speak a false word or to do a base deed, those whom we shall

reverence as well as love, to whom we shall look up rather than down, whose example will encourage and stimulate us to whatsoever things are true and lovely and of good report. We naturally and inevitably become like that which we sincerely and cordially admire. And if a human friendship does so much, what can a Divine friendship not do? 'We all, with unveiled face reflecting as a mirror the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image' (2 Co 3^{18}). 'Changed' is too weak a word. The same term is used to describe the transfiguration of Christ (Mk 9^{2}). As we reflect the glory of His moral and spiritual perfection, we are 'transfigured.' If we abide in uninterrupted fellowship with Christ, we come to have the mind (*νοῦς*) of our Divine Friend. It has often been noted that the husband and wife who have shared each other's inmost thoughts and feelings for half a lifetime, have the same expression in their faces, which mirror the two souls that love long ago made one. Montaigne, with tender memories of a youthful friend who was his *alter ego*, writes wistfully of the 'sacrament' of friendship, but he had too little faith to realize his own fine conception. Christ calls all His followers to participate in a Divine friendship which consummates itself by making them partakers of His Divine nature.

This Divine and redeeming friendship is, of course, lasting. It is everlasting. On the day after Christ said to His disciples, 'I have called you friends,' He died. But that could terminate the sweet and holy relationship. For a brief space His death interrupted it, but He rose again to renew and perfect it. Probably all pure love is in its very nature enduring. 'Amavimus, amamus, amabimus.' Tennyson was bereaved of his friend Hallam, and for a time the perplexity of his mind equalled the grief of his heart. But he could not finally doubt his intuitions of immortality. 'Peace!' he cried, 'let it be! for I loved him, and love him for ever; the dead are not dead, but alive.' Christ's victory over death confirms that instinctive conviction. In spite of many waters and floods, Divine love is unquenchable. The friends of Christ share all the power of His resurrection-life. He will not let them be resolved into a handful of dust and cease to be. His covenant of friendship cannot be broken. Here are 'ties which nought can sever.'

After having initiated His disciples into this new relationship, Christ was confident that He could send them into all the earth to found His Church, to establish His kingdom. Without it the task would have been impossible, but with it the issue could not for a moment be doubtful. The Church of Christ is just the communion of His saints, the fellowship of His friends. It cannot repose on a foundation of abstract dogma, however strong; it cannot win the world by an artistic ritual, however impressive. The secret of its strength and permanence is a human friendship which is the invariable concomitant of a Divine friendship. The minister of a seaport town in the east of Scotland was lately struck by the appearance at his week-night meeting of a stranger with the air of a foreigner, who seemed to be thoroughly entering into the spirit of the whole service. At the close, when the others had gone, the stranger waited to exchange greetings with the minister, who found to his astonishment that he did not know a single word of English. He was a Norseman who had stepped ashore for a day, and had somehow been led into that gathering of Christian folk. For a time the two men could only converse in dumb signs, till at length the stranger uttered two words which are the same in his Norse language as in our own English. The words were—'Jesus Christ.' There the two men were, with their different languages, their different nationalities, their different Churches—everything apparently different. Yet there was no difference, because they had one faith. There is no freemasonry to compare with that. The nearer the radii of a circle come to the centre, the nearer they come to one another. Christ is the Centre of the new humanity, which with all its diversities is one family. On a twofold friendship—that of Christ to His disciples, and that of His disciples to one another—the Catholic Church of God is broadly and deeply based. Christ was justified in His expectation. He sent His servants, whom He glorified as His friends, to bring forth fruit, and that their fruit should remain. They multiplied the friendship a thousandfold. They proved throughout the great world that Jew and Gentile, barbarian and Scythian, bond and free, are all unified in Christ Jesus.

Christ in this passage puts His finger upon what is lacking in the service of many of His followers. They are absolutely conscientious; they have a strong, unflinching sense of duty; they would no more neglect their obligations to God than their

responsibilities to their own flesh and blood. They live ever in the Taskmaster's sight. Still they have the unpleasant feeling that they have not discovered the secret which makes the yoke easy and the burden light. They confess to themselves, if not to others, that they find the service of God somewhat irksome. They scarcely realize the meaning of the words, 'To do thy will, O Lord, I take delight.' But Christ has something more to give them. Christianity is not merely a Divine Service; it is a Divine Service transfigured by a Divine Friendship. Nothing but the alchemy of love ever transmutes a leaden service into a golden. 'And Jacob served seven years for Rachel; and they seemed unto him but a few days, for the love he had to her.' Whitefield was once asked, 'Do you never tire of your work for God?' He answered, 'Sometimes I tire in it, but never of it.' Christ's service is perfect liberty. No one can grow weary in well-doing who lives in the light of a friendship which changes all duties into delights. When Christ says, 'Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you,' the condition is added not to chill and daunt, but to encourage and inspire. 'As you obey my behests, assure yourselves always of my love.' Epictetus said, 'I am free and the friend of God, because I obey Him willingly. We misunderstand our Lawgiver, the Lord of the Christian conscience, if ever we think Him a stern Master. Those words which Wordsworth addressed to abstract Duty are surely most applicable to Him:

'. . . Thou dost wear
The Godhead's most benignant grace,
Nor know we anything so fair
As is the smile upon Thy face.'

Arnold's lines in his *Rugby Chapel*, 'Servants of God!—or sons,' etc., have caught the secret, which would be expressed with equal truth in this form:

'Servants of Christ!—or friends,
Shall I not call you?
Since not as servants ye know
Your Master's innermost mind.'

This perfect friendship is the realization of one of Plato's noblest dreams (*Symposium*, Jowett's trans. 211–212). 'What if man had eyes to see the true beauty—the Divine beauty, I mean, pure and clear and unalloyed? . . . Do you not see that in that communion only . . . he will be enabled to bring forth not images of beauty, but realities . . . and bringing forth and nourishing virtue, to become the friend of God and be immortal, if mortal man may?'

Literature.

THE IDEAL OF JESUS.

The Ideal of Jesus (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net) is the title of a new book by Professor William Newton Clarke of Colgate University, the author of that most popular book, *An Outline of Christian Theology*, a book which has now reached its nineteenth edition.

This book is not less remarkable, and may be not less popular. We have heard much, though not so much lately, of the cry, 'Back to Christ.' Professor Clarke would repeat that cry. But in a new sense. 'Back to Christ' meant away from the Apostle Paul with his theology, to the historical facts and incidents of the Gospels. Dr. Clarke believes that we have very little concern with the outward events of Christ's life. They are the events of a Son of man upon the earth, but they were never intended by Christ Himself to be reproduced by any other son of man. Christ did not do as Muhammad did, stereotype for all time the fashions of a particular period in history and a particular spot on the face of the earth. What He came to do, and what He did, was to furnish an ideal which every man and every generation of men should strive thereafter to fulfil according to their own ability and circumstances.

The test, therefore, of every man is this: Has a man the spirit of Christ, and does he interpret his life in accordance with that spirit, using his gifts and his experiences as the raw material out of which the mind of Christ shall be formed in him? And this is the test of every Church. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; the Ideal of Jesus striven for and in measure realized by the corporate body is everything.

What, then, is the Ideal of Jesus? It takes a book of more than 300 pages, written in the severe and beautiful style of this accomplished author, to answer that question, and even then it is answered inadequately: how should we be able to answer it in a sentence? We invite our readers to the book. It contains sermons in abundance; and, more than that, it contains Christian men and a Christian Church.

PRINCIPAL FORSYTH.

'Whatsoever things are . . . lovely.' Dr. P. T. Forsyth might have chosen these words, if he had cared to choose any words, as a motto for his new book. He writes on 'Art, Ethic, and Theology.' But not as art, ethic, or even theology; only as they may become obedient servants of the Lord Jesus Christ. And so he calls his book *Christ on Parnassus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net).

Christ on Parnassus. Not Parnassus alone; that is ancient paganism. And not Parnassus on Christ; that is modern secularism. Dr. Forsyth flatly contradicts the claim, 'Art for art's sake.' His claim is 'Art for Christ's sake.'

Long ago the Psalmist who wrote the first Psalm declared that the man of God was the only man who developed freely and made it clear what a man could be. He said, 'He is like a tree planted by the streams of water.' Is there a finer thing to look upon in Nature? Such a tree has realized itself; such a man realizes himself. Dr. Forsyth would agree. The man of God takes all that art and science have to give and makes it food for his spiritual life. For all things are his, that he may grow thereby.

But the book is not homiletical. In studying art, Dr. Forsyth has returned to his earliest enjoyment—or rather in publishing his studies; for he has been studying art all the while. He is therefore able to instruct others. What he says on the principles of art, whether in painting or in poetry, is well said and worth saying. But not less instructive is his criticism of particular artists or works of art, particular painters and their painting, particular poets and their poetry, or even particular musicians and their music.

As for the style: though the book was first delivered as lectures, the style is very full, a swollen and dangerous river when compared with the style of the lectures which the author delivered in Manchester. Yet it is severe and simple when compared with some of his theological writing; and once one gets into the current of it, one goes on to the end without damage and with the sense of having had a great time and of having gathered a store of good memories.

THE BUSHMAN.

A notable addition has been made to the literature of Folklore. And it is well, both for the volume itself and for the study of Folklore, that it has to do with South Africa, in which there is so much general interest at the present time. It is a selection of Bushman folk-tales. The selection is made from a vast store collected partly by the late Dr. W. H. I. Bleek, and partly by Mr. L. C. Lloyd. Mr. Lloyd has edited the volume for the press, and done everything that man could do to make it worthy. The publishers have not been behind. The native drawings and paintings are reproduced faithfully on good paper, as if they were the work of some distinguished artist. When in colour, the colour is retained. The printing of the Bushman text (which is given on the page opposite to the translation) must have been a trying experience for all engaged on the book. Many signs new to the European typefounder had to be employed, and some letters required three or four marks above or below them to bring out their proper sound. All this has been overcome; and now it is for those who are alive to the value of folklore to see that the labour does not go unrewarded. The title of the book is *Specimens of Bushman Folklore* (George Allen; 21s. net).

Dr. McCall Theal, the historian of South Africa, has written an Introduction. He believes that at one time the Bushmen occupied the whole of the African Continent. Now they do not own a single acre of it. They were gradually driven into the forests or crushed down to the far South by stronger races. In the forest they maintained and still maintain a difficult and dark existence, for Dr. Theal believes that the Pygmies and the Bushmen are of the same original race. In the South they were more and more pressed by the Hottentots and Bantu, till the white man came and practically wiped them out. Every man's hand was against them, and so they passed out of sight, but perished fighting stubbornly, dis-

daining compromise or quarter to the very last. For, says Dr. Theal, 'there is no longer room on the globe for palæolithic man.'

NAPOLEON.

A remarkable book has been published by Messrs. Macmillan under the title of *The Corsican* (7s. 6d. net). It is described on the title-page as 'A Diary of Napoleon's Life in his own Words.' From letters and from dispatches, extracts are taken and so arranged that Napoleon is made to write his own history from the very beginning to the very end, a complete history of his career without a word from anybody else. Whether or not it had all actually been set down in a diary, it is not easy to make out, and it does not matter. The book is unique, not only in Napoleonic literature, of which there is great plenty in this world, but also, we should say, in the still larger field of literature called biography. And it is intensely interesting. It is not a whit more scrappy than diaries usually are, and there is the hand of genius in every scrap. The reflexions are just as impetuous as the marches and the battles. Thus: 'Ivy will cling to the first met tree, that, in a few words, is the whole history of love. What is love? The realization of his weakness that sooner or later pervades the solitary man, a sense both of his weakness and of his immortality:—the soul finds support, is doubled, is fortified; the blessed tears of sympathy flow,—there is love.'

The moralist will find many an illustration in these pages, where everything is set down in ruthless disregard of the finer feelings. Speaking of the historical scene in the garden of the Tuileries, when the mob compelled the king of France to place the red cap of republicanism on his head, 'How could they let the rabble in?' demands Napoleon. 'They ought to have mowed down four or five hundred of them with cannon, and the others would still be running.' Then he adds this searching sentence: 'When I was told that Louis had put a red cap on his head, I concluded that his reign was over, for in politics an act that degrades can never be lived down.'

'During the century which has now passed since Warren Hastings was acquitted of the charges brought against him by the House of Commons, posterity has endorsed the remark of the Prince Regent to the Allied Sovereigns, that he was "one of the most deserving, and, at the same time, one of the worst used men in the Empire."' So there is no longer any need to raise again that historical controversy. If Burke were extensively read, it might be otherwise. But Burke does not seem to be read now even by serious politicians. The last to read him was John Morley.

It is, however, the distinction of Sir Charles Lawson to have made belief in the guilt of Warren Hastings quite impossible. He has done this by writing *The Private Life of Warren Hastings, First Governor-General of India* (George Allen; 10s. 6d.). The book was first published in 1895. The second edition was called for in 1905, and a third edition is published this year. Sir Charles Lawson spared no pains to make his book reliable both in detail and in the general impression. He was less concerned with the claims of style. But he wrote easily, unaffectedly, and above all sincerely. Even if it were less interesting as a biography than it is, the book would be extremely valuable from the documents and illustrations it contains, all of historical value and some of them quite priceless.

To the Dublin University French Texts there has been added a volume of *Extracts from the Memoirs and other Works of Saint Simon*, edited by Mr. B. M. Nevill Perkins, B.A. (George Allen).

Astonishingly cheap, even in the day of cheap literature, and astonishingly learned, in the day when scholarship is so prevalent, are the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.' For instance, Professor James Hope Moulton's *Early Religious Poetry of Persia* could not easily be surpassed scientifically as an introduction to its subject, or artistically in the use of the English language. Yet it is a quarto of 170 pages, well bound in pictorial cloth, and it costs only 1s. net.

In 1893, Dr. Armitage Robinson, then Norrisian Professor of Divinity in Cambridge, subsequently Dean of Westminster, now Dean of Wells, issued in the 'Cambridge Texts and Studies,' an edition of Origen's Philocalia. The text was the best attainable. And so, when the Rev. George Lewis, M.A., resolved to translate the Philocalia into English, he used Dr. Robinson's text. The translation has now been published by Messrs.

T. & T. Clark under the title of *The Philocalia of Origen* (7s. 6d. net). The volume is printed and bound in uniformity with the 'Ante-Nicene Library.'

It is unnecessary now to say anything about the Philocalia itself. What it *is* necessary to say is about the translation.

It is scarcely ever the case that a reader of Greek prefers a translation to the original. But here it will be done. Mr. Lewis has accomplished the rare feat of giving a nearly literal translation, a translation that is not only adequate but suggests the original language, and yet in excellent idiomatic English.

It is a long time since we have had a number of the 'Cambridge Texts and Studies.' Is it because the General Editor, as Dean of Westminster, was too much occupied otherwise? At the Deanery of Wells he will have more leisure. The author of the part just issued (it is Part II. of vol. viii.) is Mr. W. A. L. Elmslie, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College. Its subject is the treatise 'Aboda Zara of the Mishna, of which the topic is Idolatry. The title accordingly is *The Mishna on Idolatry* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net).

The Texts and Studies are contributions to Biblical and Patristic literature. This part may be said to be neither Biblical nor Patristic. It is really both, although indirectly. But be that as it may, we are very thankful to have such an edition of the 'Aboda Zara as this, for its own sake and for the sake of English scholarship. It is easy to talk of English neglect of this and that department of literature; but the neglect of Jewish literature is a charge to which we have no reply. A few more volumes like this would enable us to hold up our heads again.

The text and translation are given on opposite pages. Below the text there is a full *apparatus criticus*. The translation is defended and illustrated in footnotes, which are printed in double column and prove to be a most valuable commentary on the Word. Larger questions are treated in an occasional excursus, and in three appendixes. There is a clear and very competent introduction. Finally, there is a valuable vocabulary and a careful short series of indexes.

The latest edition of Macaulay's *Lays* is also the best. The editor is Mr. P. C. Parr. It is published at the Clarendon Press (2s.).

In publishing his lectures given in Westminster Abbey, Canon Barnett first of all defends the title he has given them: *Religion and Politics* (Wells Gardner; 2s. 6d. net). He defends it by saying that to him religion is more than Church government, and politics is more than parties. He is not afraid as a parson to preach politics. The Hebrew prophets have taught us that there is no true religion which does not embrace active morality, and active morality must be expressed in practical politics. His topics are The Call to the Nation, Pauperism, Luxury, Drunkenness, Impurity, Ignorance, War—every one of them religious, ethical, and political. The divorce of politics from religion is as disastrous as the divorce of religion from morality.

In *Chundra Lela*, the story of a Hindu devotee who became a Christian missionary, there is seen once more the remarkable correspondence that sometimes appears in Eastern mission work with the phenomena described in the Acts of the Apostles. This woman sees visions and dreams dreams; she is guided in utmost simplicity by the Holy Ghost. In other respects also the book is notable. It describes the Hindu ascetic as well as the Christian disciple (Philadelphia: Griffith & Rowland Press; 50 cents net).

The new volumes of Harper's 'Library of Living Thought' are *Chemical Phenomena in Life*, by Frederick Czapek, M.D., Ph.D., Professor of Plant Physiology in the University of Prague; and *The Ancient Egyptians and their Influence upon the Civilization of Europe*, by G. Elliot Smith, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., Professor of Anatomy in the University of Manchester (2s. 6d. net each). These volumes make an admirable beginning to the new season's output. They let us see how wide is the scope of the series, and at the same time how carefully the authors are chosen. These men are first in their special study; what they write carries the utmost authority. And it would be strange if, within the scope of the series, there were students who found their own particular field unvisited. Is it Chemistry? Professor Czapek's book is unrivalled as an introduction. Is it religion? Professor Elliot Smith is indispensable.

There is no simpler or more scientific introductory Hebrew Grammar than Vosen and

Kaulen's *Rudimenta Linguae Hebraicae*. Mr. B. Herder has issued the ninth edition of the book, revised by Professor Jacobus Schumacher (2s. 6d.).

If our theology here is somewhat floating and uncertain, in Australia it is steadfast and sure. And it is not because the Australian student is a generation behind us. Professor D. S. Adam, M.A., B.D., of Ormond College, Melbourne, has, under the title of *Cardinal Elements of the Christian Faith*, published a series of lectures which he delivered to the students of all Faculties attending Melbourne University (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). Now these lectures prove two things—first, that Professsor Adam is sound in the Faith; and next, that he has read all the things worth reading that have recently been written against the Faith. We take it that there is less time for pure speculation in Australia. The pressure of the secular is very strong. Men have to know where they stand, and they have to stand there steadfastly.

Professor Adam's emphasis is on the Person of Christ. But when he comes to the Atonement he is quite convinced that there is a barrier to be removed on God's side as well as on man's.

Professor Oman of Westminster College, Cambridge, has written a volume on the doctrine of the Church. It has neither preface nor index, but all that should have lain between those two is very fine. Professor Oman has not yet attained to that command of the English language which he must attain to if he is to become the influence on English theology which we all expect of him. His knowledge, however, is undeniable. His knowledge of this particular subject is probably unsurpassed. He was chosen to write the general article on the Church in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

Professor Oman calls his book *The Church and the Divine Order* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). That title suggests criticism, and the book is critical from the first page to the last. Its criticism is always searching; it is sometimes severe; it is never savage. There may be bias. Not even a Presbyterian can be wholly without it. But there is no bad temper. If throughout its history the Church has not agreed with the Divine Order, if its most boastful branches are now furthest from that agreement, Professor Oman says so. But he writes no longer with the fierceness of a downtrodden, dark-futured Nonconformity. He knows that his position in the Church is now just as secure as his possession of the Bible. Ending with a chapter on the Task of the Present, he shows that the question is no longer one of Conformity or Nonconformity. It is the question whether the Church is to be governed by the Spirit of God within or by the hand of man without. It is a keen controversy and may be prolonged, but he has no fear of the result of it.

Mr. A. T. Schofield, M.D., is the author of many books touching the borderland between Science and Religion. His latest book he calls *Studies in the Highest Thought* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). It is a layman's conception of the Christian life. For once the language of Science is left behind. The heart has conquered the head. Mr. Schofield is more concerned that we should make our peace with God than that we should know the points of dispute between Darwin and Weismann.

There are readers of the *British Weekly* we could name who fly first of all to the correspondence column written by Professor David Smith. It is indeed the first time, so far as we are aware, that this ancient feature of the weekly newspaper has been made of universal interest and a real encouragement to righteous life and sound doctrine. A volume has been formed out of that column. Its subjects have been arranged under general headings—the Holy Ministry, the Work of Grace, and the like; and valuable indexes have been added to the whole. The title is *Christian Counsel* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.).

Most attractive outwardly is *The Garden of Love* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). And most attractive inwardly. It is a gathering made by May Byron, of poems from the English poets, all on the single subject of Love. The poems are arranged in order of the seasons. For it is a belief of ancient origin that Love follows the course of the Sun, and it has prevailed throughout all the ages. And, again, under each season there is variety in Love. Thus Autumn opens with the ardent lover and closes with the happy husband. But love laughs at locksmiths—even in a methodical anthology.

'I know a house where, over the mantelpiece, is a print of Leonardo da Vinci's famous picture of the Last Supper, the picture now faded and defaced, on the wall of the refectory in the convent of St. Maria delle Grazie, at Milan.

'In the house was a little boy of four, and no one had ever shown him the picture or said anything about it to him.

'One day he suddenly said to his mother: "There's a King in that picture."

'"What do you mean, John?" said his mother.

'"There's a King in that picture," he repeated.

'She picked him up in her arms and took him to the mantelpiece, and thne he put his tiny finger on the figure of Jesus in the centre of the picture.

'Jesus is seated at the table, and has just said to the twelve apostles that one of them will betray Him. He wears no sign of kingship except the expression on His face. But that child had seen the King.

'Now I hope the reader of this book, though a little child, will say, "There's a King in that picture."

'It is the history of one who lived a lowly life of love and service, and died a shameful death. But every one ought to be able to recognize the King.'

We have quoted from the Introduction to Dr. Horton's Life of Christ for young people. The man who can begin so can continue as pleasantly. What he says of Professor David Smith's book—that it is the best Life for grown folks—we say of his own book; it is the best Life we know for young people. The illustrations also are of first rank. They are the work of Mr. James Clark, R.I.

The title is *The Hero of Heroes* (Jarrold; 3s. 6d. net).

Richard Wagner's autobiography, *Mein Leben*, has not yet been translated into English. But we are now in possession of two books which give the English reader much intimate acquaintance with the man. One is his letters to his first wife 'Minna,' translated two years ago; the other is his family letters, just rendered into the same familiar English by the same translator, William Ashton Ellis, and published by Messrs. Macmillan. The title is *Family Letters of Richard Wagner* (3s. 6d. net). We shall be content to review the book by simply quoting one of the letters. We have searched for it carefully. It tells us more of the man than any other we have come upon:

'Dear Fränze,—Your letter gave me true and great delight, but don't suppose it was because you praised me so; no, it was because I feel that it expresses in the most natural manner, and perhaps quite unconsciously, that inner discontent without which no one now can be a genuine human being. It is the first time I have made your true acquaintance: that Dresden comedian-mart had raised a wall between us; I always deemed you serious and thoughtful, and yet I never knew distinctly how I stood with you in such surroundings. So it delights me to see this development in the good side of your nature.

'I am mistrustful of everybody concerned with the Theatre of to-day, and feel about actors as the Police-court with men: whom it looks on as rogues till confronted with the cryingest proofs to the contrary. How many of you arrive at so much as remarking that you're strictly thrown together with a thorough pack of vagabonds; how far fewer escape from the slough to pure artistry! Your whole family has really only got the first length; reach the second yourself, and I'll bid you hearty welcome. No one knows better than I, that the performer is the actual artist; what would I not give to have been the impersonator of my own heroes! How happy, happy I should be! My whole art is nothing but a weft of yearning thought, eternal wish and inability; for ability means making actual progressing from conception and aim to deed and reality. But that actuality is in the hands of the Comedian world nowadays, where high wages, fine dresses, and newspaper puffs are the principal objects. Rescue yourself from it as well as you can; but above all shun no griefs nor disagreeables, for at that price alone can we now be men and artists: the soft-shelled stays slave and comedian. Do not blench at the bitterest gall in the cup; to a sound nature it gives strength and self-confidence, and finally a proud disdain of all that's vulgar, a cheerful mind and true felicity.

'I will give you one more counsel for your happiness. Should you find a man you can't help loving, love him with your fullest heart and

soul—and send God and the world to the Devil for what they may say! This world can give you nothing but vexation, yourself alone that love which passes everything, and without which all besides is empty, null and dead. Never let false humility arise in you: where it abides, there lurks false pride. Never trim your course to base demands, but resist them with all the loftiness whereof you're capable in your affection for the high. Play the rebel wherever you can,—never swerve an inch from your conviction; and where'er you can't conquer, just laugh and be cheerful.—I can give you no better advice, for I have learnt for myself that I was unhappy for only so long as I wasn't *thorough*, but made an impossible attempt to mingle fire and water, good and bad. To-day—however much I have to suffer, whatever poignant griefs I feel, I suffer in reality no more: I look death in the face at each instant, and thereby recover my liking for life; for I can be cheerful and proud now—in my contempt for any life without true substance.'

If you happen upon *The Land of your Sojournings*—it is a volume of sermons which have been written by the Rev. Wilfred S. Hackett (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net)—turn first of all to the sermon on 'Clouds.' It is not the only good sermon. There are better sermons, indeed, in the book. But it will make its impression on you most immediately. And the impression will be one of strong comfort. Clouds, says Mr. Hackett, mean trouble. How strange, then, that God should choose to lead His people by a cloud, wrapping His glorious presence in so unfriendly a cloak. 'I travelled away from Liverpool one afternoon with another passenger in the compartment. He gazed from each window in turn with the liveliest interest, and at length remarked, "What a lovely thing it is to see a cloud in the sky!" Then he explained that he had just landed from South Africa, where for nine months in the year they have the unbroken blue above until the eyes ache with the sight. I was able to assure him that he need not expect to suffer from that trouble now that he had reached our northern clime. Yet imagination may help us to understand his point of view. There is a beauty even in the cloud. Remember the finest sunset that you ever watched, when the heraldic glory of crimson and purple and gold shone out and the skies became a stained-glass window of eternity. What made the unutterable beauty? The sun truly, but not the sun alone. That spectacle was wrought in clouds. And if sometimes at high noon we are discontented that the heavens wear a grey and lowering aspect, we need only remind ourselves that the cloud gives light—by night.'

A complete though concise *History of Economic Thought* has been written by Professor L. H. Haney of the University of Texas (Macmillan; 8s. 6d. net). The question he had first to settle was whether the history should be biographical or geographical or evolutionary. He decided to use all these three methods throughout. We find accordingly, after the general introduction and after a sketch of economic thought in ancient and mediæval times, a great section on the evolution of economics as a science, which is subdivided into the founders, the earlier followers, and the opponents. And under each of these subdivisions we have the great names in Economics gathered into countries, and singly described in longer or shorter sections according to the value of the contribution which they made to economic thought. Does this look a little complicated? It is really quite clear in the volume, and it has this advantage, that you can separate your man and learn all you need to know about him; you can also separate the country to which he belongs and see what its economic tendencies have been; or you can read the whole history of economic progress by reading the book right through.

A new book by the Rev. C. Silvester Horne is acceptable. So is a new exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. And when these two acceptable things come together we receive them very thankfully. The title given to this exposition of the Sermon is *The Model Citizen* (Memorial Hall; 1s. 6d.).

Professor Bruce of Glasgow used to say that when visiting the bereaved, he sometimes found that where his words had no entrance, the singing of a hymn softly and sympathetically brought comfort. Those who desire to try that method of consolation should have at their hand *The Stronghold of Hope*. It is a collection of hymns suitable for those in sickness as well as those in

sorrow. It has been compiled by that old compilatory hand, Mary Wilder Tileston (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net).

It is the business of all preachers of the gospel, and of all believers in it, to present Christianity to the modern mind. The difference between one and another is not in the demand made upon them, but in their ability or honesty in carrying it out. The Rev. Samuel McComb, M.A., D.D., fulfils this task with transparent honesty and with more than average ability in a book which he entitles *Christianity and the Modern Mind* (Methuen; 5s. net). Take his treatment of the Resurrection, for example. Of the conviction in the minds of the early disciples that Christ did rise again from the dead, Dr. McComb has no doubt whatever. The value of belief in the Resurrection for the modern mind lies therefore in the conviction generated by the Spirit of God through some real though not necessarily physical appearance of the Saviour, that He still lived, that He had broken the barriers of the grave, that He was still a power in the world.

Out of the sermons of forty years' preaching Dr. McIlveen has selected twelve, and published them with the title *Christ and the Christian Life* (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net). Has he chosen these twelve because he thinks them finer than all the rest? No, but because they contain the gospel message, each unmistakably and together fully.

'For myself,' says Dr. Alexander Whyte, 'I keep John Newton on my selectest shelf of spiritual books'; and he adds, 'by far the best kind of books in the whole world of books.' So Messrs. Morgan & Scott, determining to issue John Newton's *Cardiphonia* (3s. 6d. net), did prudently in asking Dr. Whyte to write the introduction.

Messrs. Nisbet have already published *The Gist of the Lessons* for 1912, by R. A. Torrey (1s. net).

More and more the sermon to young men is becoming a feature of our present-day preaching. The difficulty is to find materials for it. Beyond almost all known writers, Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis provides the materials that are most effective. He provides not only idea and illustration, but also inspiration. For there is in all his books an atmosphere of nobility, the nobility of principle, that is so much more than push or perseverance. Dr. Hillis has already published four volumes: *A Man's Value to Society*, *The Investment of Influence*, *Great Books as Life Teachers*, and *Faith and Character*. His publishers are Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, who now issue a fifth volume entitled *The Contagion of Character* (3s. 6d. net).

You may now purchase the most popular books on practical religion of our day, we mean the books of Dr. J. R. Miller, for one shilling and sixpence. At least you may purchase the best of them for that sum, and yet in beautiful type and handsome binding. The latest issue is *A Help for the Common Days* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier).

Can anything new be written about drunkenness? Yes; Mr. T. M. Davidson, M.A., B.Sc., F.E.I.S., has written something new. He has taken seven great masterpieces of sculpture and made them the inspiration of seven original temperance talks which he calls *In the Coils* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s.). The first is the Laocoön, the last is Michelangelo's David.

We have not heard so much of the Lucknow Conference of 1911 as we heard of the Edinburgh Conference of 1910, but it also was very notable. And unless the first volume of the literature resulting from it is out of sight the best that it could produce, the papers read and the addresses given must have been quite as memorable. Eleven papers sent in by women to the Lucknow Conference have been published in a volume entitled *Daylight in the Harem* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net). It is the first of three volumes which the Executive Committee has determined to bring out. It is the women's volume. And every paper in it is the work of a woman who knows what she writes about intimately and even painfully, and who writes with the determination to make others know. These papers are literature, varying in individuality, but all remarkable for clearness of thought and terse appropriateness of language. You may depend upon it that this

winter at least you will not find a volume better suited for reading in women's meetings.

Dr. Paul Carus has had a translation made of Professor Cumont's standard work on *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, and it has been published by the Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago, with an introductory essay by Professor Grant Showerman of Wisconsin (8s. 6d.). The volume contains the lectures which Professor Cumont delivered in 1905 at the Collège de France on the Michonis Foundation, together with those which he delivered in 1906 on the Hibbert Trust at Oxford. In addition to these lectures the volume contains sixty pages of notes. These notes are really of greater value to the advanced student than the work itself. But the work itself is very pleasant to read, and it seems to have been admirably translated.

From the Pilgrim Press comes the annual volume of *Young England* (5s.). Boys' magazines seem to have a shorter life than any other form of literature, no doubt because boys become men so rapidly. But *Young England* is always young and always acceptable. This is its thirty-second annual volume. The same press issues two handsome olive-edged volumes, one for girls and one for boys, both written by well-tried authors. Miss Evelyn Everett-Green writes the girls' book, and calls it *A Disputed Heritage* (3s. 6d.). The illustrations are by Savile Lumley. The boys' book is written by Robert Leighton. It is a story of the Rising in 1745. Its title is *The Kidnapped Regiment* (3s. 6d.).

There comes also from the same press a timely book of lessons on Peace and Internationalism, written by Margaret Pease. The title is *True Patriotism* (1s. net).

Professor Sampey of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has written a complete history of the origin and development of *The International Lesson System* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). He has written it popularly. Indeed, he delivered the chapters of the book, first of all, as a course of lectures before the Faculty and Students of his Seminary. But, in addition to the pleasant story which he tells, he gives in an appendix, first of all, a classified list of the lessons from their commencement in 1872 to the year 1912; next, a list of the special primary and advanced courses issued in 1895; then, a list of the graded series which was issued in 1908; and, last of all, a page of important dates in Sunday School work from July 1780, when Raikes opened his school, to June 1908, when the completely graded series was authorized by the Twelfth International Convention.

Is Christian Socialism an impossible combination of words? But then, if that is so, how are we to describe shortly *The Social Task of Christianity*? Professor Batten of Des Moines College describes it by using those very words as the title of his book (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). And that seems to be the shortest designation we can find. For the word Socialism has been carried away from Christianity, and it does not seem possible just yet to get it back. Dr. Batten holds that Christian men and women have been occupied long enough with the salvation of their own souls. They must now give themselves to the amelioration of their neighbours' bodies. And that is a great task. Perhaps, as he claims, the task of this generation. How great it is and how supremely difficult, this book makes manifest. Let us give ourselves to it, but let us never forget that the Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

As a writer of books for young men, Mr. John T. Faris is not so good as Dr. Hillis, but he is good. He has not quite the same intellectual insight, but he is more dramatic in his manner of writing. His book, which has the title of *Making Good*, has reached a second edition (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

The art of growing old may be said to be an art we are born with. And yet it seems to be very difficult to acquire. Too many of us are anxious to grow old in our own way, instead of looking to the hand of God upon us and following His way. The Rev. James M. Campbell, D.D., has written the student's manual of the subject. Choosing a familiar line from Browning's 'Rabbi Ben Ezra' he has called his book *Grow Old Along With Me* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). Now, our own opinion is that no manual is necessary. We commend Dr. Campbell's book, therefore, not as a scientific grind for men and women who are growing old, but as a delightful book to have in

the hand and read, both the poetry and the prose of it, at easy intervals.

There was a time, at least in Scotland, when such a title as *The School of the Church* had a meaning. For before the passing of the Education Act every church in Scotland had its school. But it was a day school. When the Rev. J. M. Frost, M.A., D.D., writes on *The School of the Church* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net), he means to describe the Sunday School, which every church in America has attached to it. Nominally we have a sort of Sunday School attached to our churches even in this country. But that word 'nominally' covers a multitude of sins. What the Sunday School ought to be, and what it would be to the church if it were what it ought to be, you will find in this book.

The study of Religion is making progress by leaps and bounds. It will be the most distinctive mark of the beginning of the twentieth century. Its literature is growing in volume, and more than that, it is growing in scientific apprehension. The field is the world and no single author can compass it. Dr. Robert A. Hume has chosen the corner called India. The title of his book—*An Interpretation of India's Religious History* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net) is not a very happy one. It is neither clear in itself nor descriptive of the contents. But Dr. Hume himself knows his subject. He may be safely taken as an authority on the history of Religion in India. In this book, he gives us first of all a sketch of the early religious history of India, next a sketch of the later religious history. Then he writes a rapid description of modern Hinduism, and in the next chapter estimates its weakness as well as its strength. He closes his book with a chapter on India's preparation for the Christ, and Christ's power to meet that preparation. In that chapter you discover at last the height of emotional eloquence to which Dr. Hume in his writing can rise.

Mr. Robert Scott has undertaken the issue of a new series of commentaries, to be called 'The Reader's Commentary.' The editors are Professor Dawson Walker of Durham, and Principal Warman of St. Aidan's Theological College. The style is demy 8vo, very like Methuen's 'Westminster Commentaries' in outward appearance.

The first volume issued is *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (3s. 6d. net). It is edited by the Rev. H. G. Grey, M.A., Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford. The text used is that of the Revised Version. The notes are those of a scholar.

It was clever of Mr. Robert Scott to discover Canon Macnutt and secure him for his 'Preachers of To-day.' Some of us had discovered him already and had been doing our best to make known his excellent qualities as a preacher. But publishers do not read reviews, and no doubt Mr. Scott congratulates himself on a discovery at once original and valuable. The title of the book is *The Inevitable Christ* (3s. 6d. net).

Dr. Percy Dearmer has arranged and edited a small volume of *Sermons on Social Subjects* (Scott; 2s. net). He has written one of the sermons himself and given it this title, 'Do we need a Quaker Movement?'

The Golden Lectures for 1910–1911, otherwise known as the William Jones Lectures, were delivered by the Rev. E. A. Eardley-Wilmot, M.A., who chose as his subject The Divine Purpose in Man. The Lectures are now published by the S.P.C.K., under the title of *Things that Matter* (2s. 6d.). It is a volume of Apologetic. The apologist adopts the method of simply preaching the gospel, and he deliberately gives himself to the things in the gospel that are of most account. The book is in two parts. The first part deals with the purpose secured by grace, the second with the purpose fulfilled through service.

The Sunday School Union has issued a small volume of *Missionary Stories for the Juniors* by the Rev. Ernest Price, B.A., B.D. (1s. net), and two new volumes by Edith Hickman Divall, one of which is a volume of poems entitled *What Manner of Love* (1s. 6d. net), the other a book of Daily Readings entitled *At the Master's Feet* (2s. net).

Older than ever and yet younger is *The Child's Own Magazine* (1s.) of the same publishing house. This is its seventy-eighth volume. How many of the children who rejoiced in its first numbers are alive to-day?

The one serious objection to most books of travel is that they are not books. Their authors

do not know how to write. When a traveller is also a writer there is no kind of book that sells more rapidly. David Livingstone is the great example, although no doubt he had the conspicuous addition to his accomplishments that he was a missionary.

There is a volume entitled *In the Guiana Forest*, by Mr. James Rodway, F.L.S. (Fisher Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), which has reached its second edition this year and has been enlarged. It is not the contents of a traveller's diary turned out upon the bookseller's shelf. It is a book well arranged and well written. The author has a feeling for style as well as some consideration for the intelligence of his readers. It is not only a traveller's book, however; it is the book of a naturalist. Mr. Rodway has little to say about man's religion, little about man himself, except as he is swept into the swirl of the struggle for existence. His interest is in the beasts and the birds and the plants, and in the fight they have for life.

The greatest thinker that Denmark has produced was Kierkegaard. A simple and sufficient introduction to Kierkegaard, both his life and his teaching, has been written by the Rev. F. W. Fulford. The title is simply *Sören Abaye Kierkegaard* (Cambridge: Wallis; 1s).

Christ's Teaching regarding Divorce.

By Professor the Rev. Robert Law, D.D., Toronto.

The article on Christ's teaching regarding Divorce, contributed by Archdeacon Allen to the August number of this magazine, tempts one to further discussion. Recent opinion tends to seek a solution of the perplexities of the subject in the fact that our Lord was not a legislator issuing a new moral code, and that His absolute prohibition of divorce (assuming it to have been verbally so) is to be understood, not as the language of rigid statutory enactment, but as the assertion of an ideal. Let this be admitted to the full. Jesus was no legislator in the Mosaic sense; to give a new version of the ancient Law was foreign to His aims and methods. And here, as everywhere, His chief concern was to give men a new and deeper intuition of the will of God, to reveal afresh that Divine conception by the light of which all thought and action regarding marriage and divorce ought to be governed, rather than to hedge the institution about with definite regulations—to fix the principle rather than to register possible exceptions or enter into the casuistry of the matter. Even so, the question whether or not marriage is such a union that it is *ipso facto* dissolved by unchastity is scarcely one of casuistry. It seems fundamental enough; and one can scarcely suppose that, if occasion arose, our Lord would fail to pronounce Himself regarding it. It is something more than a literary problem that is presented in the parallel passages (Mk 10^{2-9} and Mt 19^{3-9}).

In each of these passages the Pharisees put a question to Jesus 'tempting him,' and Jesus answers them, the form of the answer varying according to the form of the question. In Mark the question as to the legitimacy of divorce is put absolutely—Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? and the answer is also given absolutely—What God joined, let not man put asunder. In Matthew the question is whether divorce is legitimate for every sort of reason (κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν); and the answer is that it is not legitimate except for unchastity (μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ). And naturally the first question to be considered is, Which of the two accounts has the greater historical probability?

If Mark's account stood alone, there could scarcely be a doubt either as to the motive of the Pharisees' question, or as to the purport of our Lord's reply. They asked the question 'tempting him,' desiring and hoping to obtain an answer which would bring Him into direct collision with the Law of Moses, and thus furnish ground of accusation against Him. In this they were entirely successful. Our Lord did not tacitly ignore the traditional law, but first elicited a statement of it (Mk 10^{3}), then deliberately set it aside as a merely provisional concession to the unenlightened conscience and rude insensibility of a

dark age, and, finally, took His stand upon the original Divine ideal of marriage—the indissoluble union of husband and wife into one flesh.

Regarding this account of the conversation, two points need to be emphasized. It is incredible except on one supposition; and on another supposition it is the only account which is credible. 1. It is incredible except on the supposition that the Pharisees had reason *beforehand* to believe that our Lord held the unique doctrine of marriage and divorce which they now 'tempted' Him to announce. Whether divorce was legitimate at all, even on the ground of unchastity, no Jew, no Gentile, had ever dreamed of questioning; and it is inconceivable that the Pharisees, even for the sake of provoking an argument or procuring a ground of indictment, should have raised such an issue, unless the report of some earlier utterance of our Lord, enunciating this unheard-of doctrine, had reached their ears. That this was the case one can neither affirm nor deny. The isolated saying (Lk 16^{18}) furnishes no chronological datum; nor does Mt 5^{32}, which, moreover, as it stands in the text of the Gospel, supports the opposite view of our Lord's teaching. 2. On the other hand, if we understand the words 'tempting him' as implying all that Archdeacon Allen and others find in them—a deliberate purpose to entrap our Lord into a position of explicit antagonism to the Mosaic sanction of divorce, which might prove useful as a ground of accusation against Him—we seem shut up to Mark's account as against Matthew's; for the question as put in Matthew would not lend itself to such a purpose. But whether so definite a motive is required either by the words πειράζοντες αὐτόν, or by the circumstances of the case, is open to question.

In the entirely similar incident (Mt 22^{23-33}), where the Sadducees lay before Jesus the problem of the seven times married woman, there could be no such definitely hostile purpose; there was only the more or less malicious desire to experiment upon Him with one of the ingenious stock conundrums of their school. Is it necessary to ascribe a more deep-laid plot to the Pharisees? It is true that the word 'tempt' is not used in the account of the Sadducean episode. Let us look, therefore, at the passages in which it is used. Only in one of these does the word suggest the definite idea which is read into it here. When the Pharisees question our Lord as to the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar, Jesus 'perceiving their malice' said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Here there clearly was a deliberate endeavour to entrap Him into a declaration which necessarily would be offensive either to the civil or to the ecclesiastical authorities; but it may be observed that in explaining this intention the Evangelist does not say 'tempting him,' but uses the much stronger expression, 'that they might ensnare him in his speech' (ὅπως αὐτὸν παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ). Other cases in which πειράζειν is used to describe the motive of those who approached our Lord with questions or demands are the inquiry of the lawyer regarding the greatest commandment (Mt $22^{35ff.}$) and the demand of the Pharisees and Sadducees that He would show a sign from heaven (Mt 16^{1}); and in neither does the word connote more than an unfriendly desire to place Him in a difficult situation, and an unfriendly interest in observing what He might say or do therein. I take it, therefore, that nothing more is *necessarily* implied in the passage presently under consideration.

Thus on both points affecting the historical probability of Mark's account, as against Matthew's, the verdict must be *non liquet*. The hypothesis of previous unorthodox utterance by our Lord on the subject of divorce, which alone makes Mark's account credible, is unverifiable. Equally so is the hypothesis of a plot to lead our Lord into a position of express antagonism to the Jewish Law, which would necessitate the accuracy of Mark's account. It gives a possible but not the inevitable explanation of the incident.

Turning now to Matthew's report we find that, except for the two clauses, κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν in the question, and μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ in the answer, the course which the conversation takes is substantially the same as in Mark's—in both our Lord goes back from the legislation of Dt 24^{1} to the more primitive revelation of the Divine will in Gn 1^{27} and 2^{24}. And, again, it may be said of Matthew's account that, if it stood alone, it would commend itself as a perfectly intelligible and self-consistent record of what actually took place. The dispute as to the legitimate grounds of divorce was one of long standing among Jewish lawyers, and one regarding which the Pharisees might from various motives desire to draw Jesus into controversy. It is contended, indeed, that the course of the argument is, in Matthew's version of it, confused

and inconsistent — that Jesus first impugns the Mosaic Law, then appeals to the earlier and higher law which is implied in the Creation narrative, and then ends by tacitly reaffirming the Mosaic Law as it was interpreted by the stricter Rabbinical school. But it may be safely said that, but for the comparison with Mark, no such inconsistency would have been discovered. And substantially there is none; for it is plain that in the view of the Evangelist—of Jesus as represented by the Evangelist—the laxer interpretation put upon the Deuteronomic law by the school of Hillel was the natural and proper, as doubtless it was the generally accepted, interpretation; and the law thus interpreted our Lord decisively sets aside.

Upon the whole, then, it would seem that as regards historical probability the balance is very evenly prized between the two narratives. It remains, therefore, to discover whether any more decisive result can be reached by investigating the literary problem presented by the discrepancies of the two narratives. Of these discrepancies three possible explanations suggest themselves—separate traditions, illegitimate interpolation, legitimate interpretation. The first of these is mentioned only to be set aside. The relation of the two narratives is such, the literary derivation of one of them from the other, or of both from a common source, is so evident, as to preclude the idea that they represent independent strains of tradition.

If with the majority of modern critics we regard Mark's account as the more original, and explain the added clauses in Matthew as having been interpolated with the object of *modifying* the sense, the question at once arises, to what motive their interpolation can have been due. (*a*) It has been ascribed to the Jewish-Christian proclivities of the Evangelist, who desired as far as possible to obliterate all traces of disharmony between the Master's teaching and the ancient Law of Israel. But this supposition does not meet the facts of the case. In Matthew's version, just as distinctly as in Mark's, the Mosaic law of divorce is declared to have been merely a temporary expedient, the best, probably, that a people at a low stage of moral development was capable of receiving, but falling far short of the Divine ideal. (*b*) Archdeacon Allen, while still maintaining that the clauses are interpolated with misleading effect, now admits, and indeed contends, that they may represent authentic utterances of Jesus, which Matthew may have found in Q or in some other source. In the material conclusion which he thus reaches I wholly concur; but I am unable to reconcile the view that the additional clauses in Matthew represent what was authentic teaching of Jesus, with the other view that Mark's account, just because of their omission, is the more historical. Let one try to realize the circumstances. The Pharisees are laying a trap for our Lord, eager to exhibit Him as a propagator of heresy; and quite gratuitously He walks into the trap by expressing Himself more absolutely than He had done on other occasions, more absolutely than His real position either required or warranted. This would have been unlike Him. The more characteristic would it have been to offer to His interrogators the other horn of the dilemma, by asking them how they proposed to reconcile the law in Deuteronomy with the principle implied in Genesis (cf. Mt 21^{24-27} 22^{43-45}). (*c*) It remains that we must regard the interpolations as a concession to the weakness of human nature and the practical exigencies of society, as modifying and mollifying a law which others as well as the Twelve (Mt 19^{10}) felt to be excessively severe. This surely is a last resort. That an evangelist could deliberately manipulate the text found in his source, and that for the purpose of altering the moral standard held up by the Master to His followers, is a supposition which one does not willingly entertain.

The third possibility, legitimate interpretation, remains to be considered. May it not be that the modifying clauses in Matthew have been inserted in the more original account, with the object not of altering, but of elucidating its real significance? All parties were agreed, Shammai as well as Hillel, that unchastity was a valid ground for divorce; and since this was simply axiomatic, since difference of opinion regarding it was unimaginable, is it not a natural supposition that the remaining question, the only question at issue, might be stated broadly as the whole question—Is divorce lawful? Or, to put the case from a slightly different angle, it is tolerably certain (although I am not aware that definite information exists upon the point) that the laxer interpretation of the Mosaic Law was the one which was popularly accepted and acted upon. And if this was the case, is it not likely enough that when the question of divorce was spoken of without further definition, the reference intended

would be to the law of divorce as commonly understood and practised? (One can easily imagine a modern parallel, say in Dacotah or Kansas.)

This would be still more probable if, as is quite possible, the discussion was prompted by some contemporary *cause célèbre* in which the Hillelite interpretation of the law had been carried to an extreme. It seems to me, therefore, no incredible hypothesis that, even if the question as verbally put was—Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? what it meant was—Is this lawful for every kind of reason? And, of course, the sense in which the question was put would determine the sense in which the answer was given. If the question was whether divorce is lawful for every reason, the answer meant that it is not lawful for every reason, but only for unchastity.

Assuming that Matthew here derives from Mark, I suggest that the later evangelist, deeming the earlier account liable to be misunderstood, supplemented it by the explicative clauses. To do so would be quite in accordance with Matthew's 'interpretative' habit. It is also possible, though less probable, that both evangelists are here dependent on a common source, and that Mark abbreviated, thinking it sufficient, since the real question at issue could not be mistaken, to state it more generally.

The view here suggested of the mutual relation of the two records is no new one; but it seems to have been somewhat lost sight of in recent discussion of the subject. It may not be free from difficulty, but it does seem to me to offer the least difficult solution of a difficult problem, and the most natural explanation of the facts of the case, both historical and literary. In a full discussion, wider considerations than these would have to be taken into account. Where the documentary evidence of the teaching of Jesus upon such a subject is ambiguous, the moral elements involved must be the final criticism. But into this field of inquiry I do not now enter. The purpose of this paper is simply to offer as worthy of reconsideration the view that, if Mark's account is here verbally the more original, Matthew's was intended to give, and gives, the true interpretation.

The Idea underlying the Eschatological Discourses of our Lord.

By the Rev. Arthur Dakin, B.D., D.Th., Manchester.

Eschatology has its psychology. All its devotees have been unique personalities. They have been men possessed by one idea, which has regulated their whole life and coloured all their thought. A superficial study finds that idea to be the imminent end of the world, but a more careful consideration shows that that is but a deduction from another idea, which latter is to be regarded as really characteristic of the thinker. The same deduction has been drawn from entirely different predominating ideas. The idea underlying such eschatological thought has usually been theological. But it is by no means absurd to imagine a scientific eschatology, which would predict the end of all things on the basis of some proposition of science. What idea was it that lay behind the eschatological discourses of Jesus? To what conviction of His do such utterances bear witness? That is the question this paper essays to answer.

In His eschatology as in His work, our Lord had a forerunner, and the above principle becomes clear when we examine the message of John the Baptist. For John the day of judgment was near. The Kingdom of God was at hand, and that meant to the Baptist that the axe was already laid at the root of the tree, the one with the fan in his hand was already present. There is yet time to repent, but not much. The atmosphere here is clearly that of haste and fear, almost of panic. Now obviously what fills the eye of the Baptist is the sinfulness of his countrymen. They who had sheltered themselves behind the thought that judgment would come for the nations, but not for themselves, are warned that it is now at their

own door also. And with this conviction of the sinfulness of his fellows John has the Jewish conception of God,—a righteous God who will not spare for ever, but whose patience is even now giving place to wrath. God's *wrath* is the idea that dominates John the Baptist, and that lies at the basis of his eschatological preaching. In accordance with that, judgment is conceived by him as punishment, and punishment only. Judgment and punishment are indeed synonymous terms. Is this also the fundamental conception of Christ? Is it the wrath of God that looms large in the mind of our Lord as He predicts His second coming? Certain considerations make for the contrary.

An analysis of the discourses referred to makes clear the significance of the second coming as Jesus conceived it. It is, first of all, the time of the glorification of the Son of Man, and that in the eyes of the world. They also 'which pierced him' shall see Him (Rev 1^{7}). The second time He will come with power and glory, and all the holy angels with Him (Mk 13^{26} = Mt 25^{31}; cf. Mt 26^{64}, Lk 21^{27}, Mt 16^{27}, and Mt 19^{28}). There is to be a startling contrast with the first coming. Then, He was unrecognized, rejected. His second coming will be with such signs and power as to make both ignorance and rejection of Him impossible. But Jesus always couples with this idea of the glorification of Himself that of the vindication of those that are His. The glory of the redeemed is involved in that of the Redeemer. 'Where I am, there shall my servant be also' (Jn 12^{26}). So the purpose of the second coming is definitely stated in Mk. (13^{27}) to be 'to gather together the elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part of earth to the uttermost part of heaven.' Likewise His followers are to share His privilege of judgment (Mt 19^{28}). Consequently the significance of the end of the world is as great for the disciples as for the Master Himself. The contrast here also is with their present condition. Now, they, like Him, are despised and persecuted. Then, they will be justified in the eyes of all. The second coming signifies the reversal of the state of affairs in the early days of the Church. This becomes especially clear from the consideration of the passage in Mk 13. There the Lord introduces the subject of His second coming by a description of the sufferings of the world. This is specialized into an indication of the sufferings of the disciples, and the statement is made, 'He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved' (v.^{13}). The end means the gathering together of these suffering, enduring 'elect' (v.^{27}). That is its significance. It is the triumph of Christ, and His people with Him. Thus these discourses are but the expansion of the statement in St. John's Gospel, 'I will come again, and receive you unto myself' (14^{3}).

That being so, judgment in the thought of Jesus is not merely punishment. It is, far more, reward for those who deserve it. The picture with Him is complete. There are ten wise virgins as well as ten foolish. Two of the three men in the Parable of the Talents hear the 'Well done, good and faithful servant.' And in the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats the reward of the faithful is as emphatically stated as is the condemnation of the wicked. This element, which we miss entirely in the preaching of John the Baptist, is characteristic of the eschatology of Jesus.

In agreement with this view is another point which is always present in these discourses, namely, the solicitude of Jesus for His own. 'Be ye therefore ready, for the Son of man cometh in such an hour as ye think not,' He said (Lk 12^{40}); and the emphasis lies, not, as we often put it, on the latter clause, but on the former, 'Be ye ready.' He exhorted them to be diligent in watching, and to take heed to themselves (Lk 21^{36}, Mk $13^{33\text{-}35}$). The second coming is to be for the 'little flock' a time of great rejoicing, provided they are ready. 'And when these things come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh' (Lk 21^{28}).

The second coming, then, seems to signify pre-eminently the glorification of the redeemed. It is of the 'elect' the Lord thinks more than of the wicked. It involves condemnation for the latter, but it is rather the other side of the picture, the rejoicing of the former, that fills Christ's thought. The end is joy rather than sorrow, vindication rather than condemnation. It is the consummation of the Kingdom of God. Hence it seems to us that the idea underlying these discourses of Jesus is that idea which is incorporated in his Kingdom, namely, that of the Love of God. God is love. He has redeemed the elect. The day will come when all men will know it, when the 'elect' will be taken to their redemption, when

their trust in the Father will be vindicated. The glorification at the second coming of Christ is the final act of a loving God to those who are His. It is the Lord's vindication of His own. It is provided by God's eternal love. 'Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom' (Lk 12^{32}). In that day the Kingdom will be theirs.

It was exactly thus that the early disciples interpreted these discourses. The first generation of Christians looked forward to the end, not with dread such as the preaching of John the Baptist inspired, but with hope and enthusiasm. They regarded it as their coming day, and their belief is reflected in the Apocalypse of John, which is the natural development of the eschatology of Jesus. There the end of all is full of Christ—the Lamb—and with Him reign and rule the saints for ever and ever. Thus we conclude that the soteriological idea of Christ dominates His eschatology. The end will come not because God is a God of wrath, but because He 'loveth to the end.'

In the Study.

Mr. Allenson has published all at once three volumes of children's sermons. They are (1) *The Six Gates*, by the Rev. John Thomson, M.A., of Carmyllie (2s. 6d.); (2) *A Packet of Sunlight*, by the Rev. Morton Gledhill, of Ansdell, Lytham (1s. 6d. net); and (3) *Sunday Gleams*, by the Rev. A. G. Weller, of Toowoomba, Queensland (1s. 6d.). There is no way of reviewing children's sermons but by quotation. Here is one of Mr. Gledhill's on

Pins.

'And all the pins of the court shall be of brass.'—Ex 27^{19}.

Whoever would think of reading about pins in the Bible? Perhaps you children thought that such things were never used in Old Testament times. If you thought so, you will soon find your mistake, if you read and study this old Book. Of course the 'pins' mentioned here are not the kind you buy in rows upon paper. Those pins are so small and of such little value that perhaps some of you think they are not worth talking about. Many people will not trouble looking for a pin when it is lost, because it is worth so little and another can so easily be obtained.

Did you ever think and wonder what becomes of all the pins which are being made continuously? Pins are seldom worn out. I began to wonder, when, some years ago, I read how many pins are daily manufactured. I said to myself, Where do they all go, and whatever becomes of them? In the industry of pin-making Birmingham takes, or did take, the lead, and at the time I was reading turned out 37,000,000 per day. Other parts of this country, 17,000,000; and in different parts of Europe, other 30,000,000: and as pins are seldom broken, it means that there are about 84,000,000 pins lost daily amongst European people.

Some people are very superstitious in regard to pins, and no doubt that superstition has given birth to the rhyme:

> See a pin and pick it up,
> All the day you'll have good luck.
> See a pin and let it lie,
> All the day you'll need to cry.

I don't think you boys and girls are much troubled with superstition, yet it may be worth while to pick up pins.

Among pins there are good and bad, as in almost everything; but if a pin is to be a good one, it must have a *good head*. 'A wise man is like a pin: his head prevents him going too far.' To have a good head is as needful for boys and girls as for pins. At a certain catechism class the question was asked, 'What is the chief end of man?' and a mischievous boy answered, 'The end with the head on.' Yes, it is important to have a good headpiece; but you say, 'We cannot have any other than the ones we have already, whether they be good or bad.' That is perfectly true; but you are scholars, and much of the furnishing of the mind has to be attended to, and if you are diligent and persevering, wonders can be wrought. See to it, then, that your head gets well furnished, and don't go furnishing on the hire

system, but be prepared to pay cash down, in diligent study, for what you get.

Some years ago there used to be an omnibus which passed the house of an old philosopher named Thomas Carlyle. The driver of 'the bus' knew this old man was very clever, and was proud of having him as a passenger at times. On one occasion, when the bus stopped for the old man to get in, there was a gentleman sitting next to the driver, and not knowing Thomas Carlyle remarked, 'Driver, that old man has got a queer-shaped hat.' 'Yes,' said the driver, 'but what about the head that's in it?' The important thing is not the hat, but the head that is in it.

The next important thing about a pin is that it should have a *good point*. It makes it very difficult work, to pin something when the pin has a poor point, and especially if the material to be pinned be somewhat damp. Now you young folks will find out that you need to be sharp if you are going to make headway in life. To have a good head-piece often means to be sharp, but you need also to be quick in the execution of your work. Many years ago, my old uncle told me about a little boy attending a certain school in Yorkshire, who was very fond of playing marbles. On one occasion he went on playing with a companion he met until he was late for school. As he hurried along, thinking of the cane which he knew was in store for him, he looked at his dirty hands. He knew he would have to hold out the right hand, and at once began a form of toilet with which all boys are familiar. It was, however, a sorry wash his hand had received when the school was reached, and holding out his hand, the master looked with amazement and said, 'If you can find me a dirtier hand in this school you shall go unpunished.' The boy at once lifted his other hand and so escaped the punishment. That boy was like a pin with a good point.

There is one other thing about a pin that I must mention, and that is—it must be *straight*. Crooked pins are practically useless, and are thrown away as such. By asking you boys and girls to be straight, I mean straightforward, upright, and true. To be straight you must have a good heart filled with a great love. Jesus Christ wants to make us all straight, and only then can we be truly useful. The real value of a pin lies in its usefulness, and what is not useful usually becomes troublesome.

I read some time ago of a pin and needle, neighbours in a work-basket, who, being both idle folk, began to quarrel, as idle folks are apt to do.

'I should like to know,' said the pin, 'what you are good for, and how you expect to get through the world without a head?'

'What is the use of a head,' said the needle sharply, 'if you have got no eye?'

'What is the use of an eye,' said the pin, 'if there is always something in it?'

'I am more active and can go through more work than you can,' said the needle.

'Yes, but you will not live long, because you have always a stitch in your side,' said the pin.

'You are a poor crooked creature,' said the needle.

'And you are so proud that you cannot bend without breaking your back.'

'I'll pull your little head off if you insult me again,' said the needle.

'I'll put your eye out if you touch me,' said the pin; 'remember, your little life hangs on a single thread.'

While they were thus quarrelling, a little girl entered, and, undertaking to sew, soon broke off the needle at the eye. She then tied the thread round the neck of the pin, and, attempting to sew with it, pulled off its head, and threw it into the dirt by the side of the broken needle.

'Well, here we are,' said the needle.

'We have nothing to fight about now,' said the pin. 'It seems that misfortune has brought us to our senses.'

'A pity we had not come to them sooner,' said the needle. 'How much we resemble human beings who quarrel about their blessings till they lose them, and never find out they are brothers till they lie down in the dust together as we do.'

When you are using pins, try to remember the lessons from the pin.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Adonis und Esmun.

This is the title which Count Baudissin has given to his monograph on the 'Resurrection Gods and the Gods of Healing' (Leipzig: Hinrichs; M.24). It is a subject of the last and greatest difficulty. And in consequence the literature upon it, especially the German literature, is enormous. Graf von Baudissin is acquainted with the most of the literature, good and bad. We say the most of it, not the whole of it. For we find no reference to the relevant articles in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. This might be no great surprise, if the Encyclopædia were little known or little thought of in Germany. But nowhere in the world has it attained a larger proportionate circulation. And nowhere has it been spoken of with higher praise. Several of Graf von Baudissin's colleagues in Berlin could have told him that the articles upon his subject in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* are more relevant to his purpose, as well as more recent, than the articles to which he does make reference in *The Dictionary of the Bible*, *The Encyclopædia Biblica*, and *The Jewish Encyclopedia*.

That, however, is the only important omission that we have detected. And after all, the important thing is not whether the author is aware of all the literature on his subject, but what use he makes of the literature of which he is aware. Now, it may be said at once that Graf von Baudissin is too great a man summarily to reject everything that has been written by everybody who ever wrote before him. There is evidence in every page, not only of intimate knowledge of other men's work, but also of sympathetic and conscientious consideration of it. Our author is well aware that a vast deal has been written on his subject that is purely speculative and of practically no value; he is well aware that some of the most fantastic notions ever expressed in the language are to be found in such writings. But out of the infinite deal of nothing he laboriously sifts the grain of observation or of sound reasoning. With this great book in hand it now seems possible to relieve our shelves. Within its own limited but highly important field, it is not only the latest work, but it supersedes nearly all that has been said before it.

And yet the chief value of the book does not lie in its treatment of the literature. Above all else it is a book of original investigation. The knowledge of this subject has to be gathered in large measure from obscure or minor writings, and from inscriptions both published and unpublished. All this material Graf von Baudissin has worked over for himself, and some of it is accessible to scarcely anybody besides himself.

It is well to add that the volume has been prepared with the utmost care and evidently at very great expense. The ten plates at the end are not easily accessible elsewhere, and they are not produced in a more artistic manner anywhere.

A New History of Ancient Christian Literature.

Professor Hermann Jordan is the author of the latest *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer; M.16). It is a handsome volume, well printed on good paper, and runs to 522 large octavo pages.

Professor Jordan's great idea is to deal with the literature of the ancient Church in its development. The history of Christian literature has been too much a description of individual writings; and the students' manuals have been little more than a catalogue of these writings. Professor Jordan believes that it is possible to show that one man's work largely determined another man's work, and that every man's work arose out of the circumstances and needs of his time. He determined to show in his book that Christian literature, like all other literature, has its causes and its effects.

To carry out this idea was not easy. To make it too dominant would have been disastrous. Professor Jordan has both ability and industry. He has produced a book that will greatly delight the modern appetite for the scientific treatment of every subject. The full references to sources given in the footnotes will charm the undaunted student. And the unusual readableness of a manual of this size will delight everybody.

To the 'Texte und Untersuchungen' of Harnack and Schmidt a volume has been contributed by Alfred Schmidtke under the title of *Neue Fragmente und Untersuchungen zu den Judenchristlichen Evangelien* (Leipzig: Hinrichs; M.10). It is more than a collection of materials, it is a criticism and commentary of them. Such a volume was bound to come sooner or later; it was bound to come from Germany. And here it is as thorough, critical, and complete as could be desired.

'We have seen his star in the East.' What star did they see? And when did they see it? These are the questions which Professor Voigt of Halle sets out to answer in a volume entitled *Die Geschichte Jesu und die Astrologie* (Hinrichs; M.5). It takes him the space of 220 pages to answer them. For he has resolved that he will make his book the most thorough investigation of the subject ever published, and if possible final. The two threads he follows through the labyrinth are religion and chronology.

The most popular study in the sphere of religion in Germany at the present time is that which is described by the double adjective 'mythologico-historical.' And an excellent example of its results is a volume by Martin Gemoll entitled *Die Indogermanen im alten Orient* (Hinrichs; M. 3.60). The titles of its chapters are interesting and eloquent—

I. Tamūrā-Tahmūra-Takhmo urupa.
II. Attis-Adad.
III. Ahura-Arthur-Abram.
IV. Gideon-Gwydion und Gilead-Galaad.
V. Zum Gilgamešepos.
VI. Die Ḫatti-Mitani und ihre Verwandten.

There was nothing in the excavations at Gezer, conducted by Mr. Macalister, which caught the popular mind more than the light that was thrown on the religion of the ancient Canaanites. And it is possible that there was nothing in all the discoveries of greater value to religion and to learning. All that we now know of the religion of the Canaanites, and of the relation of the Canaanites to Israel, will be found in Dr. Franz Böhl's *Kanaanäer und Hebräer* (Hinrichs; M.3.20). It is the latest issue of Professor Rudolf Kittel's *Beitrage zur Wissenschaft vom alten Testament.*

Messrs. Williams & Norgate (for J. C. B. Mohr of Tübingen) have issued the second instalment of Julicher and Bauer's new edition of Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie* (M.3.50).

The latest issues of Professor Bardenhewer's 'Biblische Studien' are *Die Dauer der Lehrtätigkeit Jesu* nach dem Evangelium des Johannes, by Joannes Maria Pfättisch, O.S.B.; and *Die Altsyrischen Evangelien* in ihrem Verhältnis zu Tatians Diatessaron, by Heinrich Joseph Vogels (Herder; 5s. each).

Two new parts have been issued of H. Appel's *Kurzgefasste Kirchengeschichte für Studierende.* These two parts form the third volume, which deals with the modern Church (Leipzig: Deichert; M.3 each).

Messrs. Beauchesne of Paris have published in their series of 'Études de Théologie Historique' a volume called *Bellarmin et la Bible Sixto-Clémentine*, by Fr. Xavier-Marie Le Bachelet, S.J. (Fr.5). Nearly half of the volume is occupied with hitherto unpublished documents, including the dissertation 'De Editione Latina Vulgata.' Here is also now to be found the fragmentary Preface to the Bible, entitled 'Biblia Sacra Vulgatae editionis Sixti V Pont. Max. jussu recognita atque edita. Romae, 1592. Prefatio ad lectorem.' There is also a useful table of the variants between the Sixtine (1592) and the Clementine (1590) Bibles.

The same publishers issue *La Dévotion au Sacré-Cœur de Jésus*, by Professor Bainvel of the Catholic Institute of Paris, in its third edition considerably enlarged (Fr.4); and *La Première Communion*, by Dr. Louis Andrieux of Rheims Cathedral (Fr.3.50). In the introduction Dr Andrieux gives first of all a list of sources 'Sur la Communion des petits enfants avant l'âge de raison,' and he names sixty-two; then a list of works on the subject which he himself has consulted, and he names no fewer than sixteen, all dealing directly, and most of them exclusively with it.

At the Librairie Lecoffre (J. Gabalda et Cie) there is published a short but competent and useful guide to that difficult subject *Jésus-Christ et l'Étude comparée des Religions.* The author is Professor Albert Valensin of Lyons.

The Jewish Papyri of Elephantinê.

By Professor A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Oxford.

We have long been awaiting with impatience the publication of the early Jewish papyri discovered by the German excavators at Elephantinê, and the work has just appeared in a form worthy both of the importance of the subject and of the scholarship and reputation of its editor.[1] It could not have been put into more competent hands than those of Professor Sachau, and the time and labour expended upon its preparation have been well spent.

The discovery of the Mond Papyri, edited by Dr. Cowley and myself, excited the German and French Governments to explore the remains of the Jewish settlement in the island of Elephantinê, opposite Assuan, the existence of which had been disclosed by them. The Germans were the first in the field, and Dr. Rubensohn soon laid bare the ruins of the old Jewish quarter, and discovered in three of the houses a number of papyri belonging to the age of Ezra and Nehemiah. The most important of these have already been given to the world by Professor Sachau. They consist of copies of a petition presented to Bagoas, the Persian governor of Judæa, and the two sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, in the year 407 B.C., relative to the destruction of the temple of Yeho (Yahu) at Elephantinê by the revolted Egyptians, together with the reply of Bagoas. We learn from them that the temple had been built in the days of the Pharaohs, and had been spared by Cambyses when 'he destroyed all the temples of the gods of Egypt,' and that it was constructed on a large and magnificent scale. The beds of some of the sandstone columns, indeed, on which the roof was supported, I have been so fortunate as to find in the quarry from which they were extracted, and they show that the columns were as large as those of the principal Egyptian sanctuaries. The petition further makes it clear that the ritual of the temple was carried out in accordance with the Levitical law; in other words, that the prescriptions of the so-called Priestly Code were clearly observed when the temple was built.

[1] *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer Jüdischen Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine.* Edited by Eduard Sachau. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911.

The additional papyri, more or less mutilated, which are now edited by Professor Sachau, consist of official and private letters, of lists of names of persons, with the amount of silver—2 shekels per man—each had to pay 'to the god Yeho,' of business documents, of ostraca and similar texts, and of two literary compositions of the highest interest and value. One of these is an Aramaic copy of the Behistun inscription of Darius I., in which the Persian monarch gives an account of his reign; the other is nothing less than the romance of Aḥiqar, the wise man of the East (called Achiacharus in the Book of Tobit), which is thus shown to have been a work of far older date than has hitherto been supposed. Enough of the papyrus remains to show that the whole story was contained in it, including the two series of proverbs, parables, and fables associated with Aḥiqar's name. It bears witness to the existence of a considerable literature in Aramaic, partly romantic, partly didactic in character, which the Jews would have read by the side of their religious literature.

One of the most curious facts that have resulted from the discovery and decipherment of the papyri is that the Jewish settlement at Elephantinê and Assuan was a military colony. The Jews formed the Persian garrison which guarded the southern frontier of Egypt and kept watch over the native Egyptians, just as the Greeks did in the Delta; hence their influence and importance, as well as the favour they enjoyed at the Persian Court. Like the Greeks, also, they had already occupied the same position under the twenty-sixth Egyptian dynasty, and the long discredited letter of Aristeas is thus proved to be correct in the statement that the Jews 'had been sent as allies to assist Psammetichus in fighting against the king of the Ethiopians.'

Professor Sachau does not venture to push back the foundation of the colony beyond the reign of Psammetichus II. But, as I have pointed out in the *Expositor*, the king in question must have been Psammetichus I. He alone was familiarly known to the Greeks as Psammetichus; Psammetichus II. was Psammis. Zephaniah, moreover, is decisive

as showing that the Jews were not only already serving against the Ethiopians in Southern Egypt, but had even made their way into the Sudan south of the Sobat in the age of Josiah (Zeph 2^{12} 3^{10}), while in the same age Necho, the predecessor of Psammetichus II., claimed to be suzerain of Judah (2 K $23^{20.34}$). It may be noted that expert opinion is now returning to the old view that the Greek and Phœnician inscriptions at Abu-Simbel belong to the reign of the first Psammetichus.

The attitude of the Jews in Elephantinê towards what we may call foreign deities is that of some of the Psalms. The national God, to whom their temple was erected, and with whose name their own names were compounded, was 'God of the gods,' 'a great king above all gods,' whose like did not exist among the other gods. But the puritanic intolerance of a Jeremiah was neither understood nor apparently even dreamed of; Anat-Bethel and Ashem-Bethel received their tribute as well as Yeho, and Professor Sachau may be right in thinking that shrines or altars of these deities stood in the neighbourhood of the temple. If so, it would only be in accordance with pre-exilic custom at Jerusalem as described by Ezekiel (ch. 8). The post-exilic exclusiveness of Yahweh-worship was due to a combination of the prophetic teaching with the influence of Zoroastrianism and opposition to Babylonian polytheism, and certain of the post-exilic Psalms are evidence that even in post-exilic Jerusalem it was long in becoming a matter of orthodoxy.

It is clear that a considerable literature is likely to grow up around the publication of the Berlin papyri from Elephantinê, and that many fashionable theories about the books of the Old Testament will have to be revised. One thing at all events is certain; the Jews at Elephantinê saw nothing inconsistent with the law of Deuteronomy in having a temple of their own in Egypt, where the ritual and sacrifices were the same as those at Jerusalem. The temple of Onias had a precedent and a predecessor in a temple which for about a century was the only Jewish temple in the world and might therefore have been regarded as the religious centre and gathering-place of the nation. What is remarkable is that though the Jewish garrison in Elephantinê bore Hebrew names it wrote and read in Aramaic. As Professor Sachau says, 'the fact is strange.'

Contributions and Comments.

The God Ashima of Hamath.

In 2 K 17^{30} אשימא (perhaps merely an inaccurate *scriptio plena* for אשמא) is mentioned as a god of Hamath before the twin-gods of the Avvites (Nibhaz and Tartak) and of the Sepharvites (Adram-melek and 'Anam-melek [cf. Bab. Almu and Allamu?]). In all Aramaic-speaking countries a vocalization of the dental nasal into the simple *spiritus lenis* is very common (*e.g. Sin* into *Si'i*, *iddin* into *iddi'*, Haran in Media (To 11^{1} into הרא (1 Ch 5^{26}), Akhamatânu = Ekbatana into אחמתא), so that, in connexion with אשמא, it is natural to think of the well-known god Eshmun.

There would then be a feminine form אשמת (Ashmatt from Ashmant, or Eshmutt from Eshmunt) in Am 8^{14}, 'They that swear by the *Ashmat* of Samaria, and say, As thy God, O Dan, liveth,' where the context urgently demands the name of a god (instead of 'They that swear by the *sin* of Samaria'). With the connexion between Israel and Hamath in religious matters compare Sargon's Hamathaic contemporary *Ilu-bi'di*. His name has a variant *Ia'u-bi'di*; therefore he must have been an Israelite.

Fritz Hommel.

Munich.

'Peter and John.'

There is a notable change between Mk 5^{37} ('John the brother of James') and Ac 12^{2} ('he killed James the brother of John'). The first phrase reflects early conditions, when St. James, presumably the elder brother, was the leading figure. (From what other 'John' was it needful to distinguish James' brother? Was it from him 'whose surname was Mark?') The second phrase reflects a later time when James the son of Zebedee was nearly forgotten. He must have been an

outstanding man—we may affirm that he must have been *the* outstanding man among the disciples—to draw upon himself the first attention of Herod Agrippa. Yet the Acts have practically nothing to tell us about him. On the other hand, it speaks—so too Lk 22^8—of 'Peter and John' $3^{1ff.}$ 8^{14}. These two remained in living recollection as foremost men.

Is not this a powerful argument against the historicity of the strange tradition, ascribed to Papias, that James and John suffered martyrdom together? What is here appealed to is not the conscious, deliberate statement of St. Luke, but his involuntary reflexion of circumstances. On the one hand, James is forgotten. On the other hand, John—only less than Peter—dominates men's thoughts. How could this be unless because John long survived James?

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Manchester.

Unbiblical Views about Biblical Matters.

A COLLECTION of such views, as suggested by Professor Nestle, should not omit the talent hid in the napkin. This is not only unbiblical, but a well-nigh impossible procedure. Of course the talent in the parable was hid in a hole in the ground. The napkin was used for the pound.

And yet few leading preachers avoid the confusion. It is in Phillips Brooks, Maclaren, Newman, Jowett, and others 'too numerous to mention.'

Perhaps it arises from the comparison generally drawn between the money talents of the parable, and the human talents of the congregation. And the preacher, with his eye on this spiritualized talent, finds it neater and more picturesque to wrap it in a napkin, than to dig a hole and bury it. But whatever may be the explanation, most preachers fall into the confusion, and so describe what is possible in the Spiritual World, in terms that are impossible in the Natural.

FRANK J. GOULD.

Brighton.

'Grace and Peace.'

IT is a probable suggestion—and it would be interesting to know the first author of it—that the combination χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη unites and deepens the Greek greeting χαίρειν and the Hebrew greeting 'Peace to you.' It is further probable, that it was not first used by Paul; for in the letter which opens the Second Book of Maccabees we find the similar combination τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς κατ' Αἴγυπτον Ἰουδαίοις χαίρειν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ . . . εἰρήνην ἀγαθήν.[1] Greenup-Moulton's *N.T.*, with fuller references, gives to Ro 1^7 the passages from the N.T.; a reference to 2 Mac 1^1 would be not out of place. *Joy* (χαρά) and Peace are combined by Paul (Ro 15^{13} 14^{17}).

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Watering with the Foot.

REGARDING the rather difficult passage in Dt 11^{10}, *Wateredst it with thy foot*, which has been explained by different commentators in different ways, I am wondering if that which I witnessed near Tripoli, North Africa, would not afford a clear explanation? At the time it appeared to me to be a perfect one.

Some Arabs were drawing water from a well by means of a wooden wheel over which a rope was suspended. On the bottom end of the rope was attached an ordinary water-skin, and this was pulled up from time to time by a cow, which walked backwards and forwards during the operation. At the side of the well was a stone reservoir into which the water was poured. By the side of this again was a field of wheat on very sandy soil, which was subdivided into small square patches by little walls of sand a few inches high. In some of these patches the wheat was green, while in others it was dry and parched. The water was now allowed to flow from the reservoir, and the bare-footed operator caused it to flow into the patches desired *by simply pressing upon the little wall of sand with his foot.* Thus the water followed his footprints from point to point in the field. The passage in Deuteronomy flashed into my mind immediately, and here, it seemed, was its meaning illustrated.

C. LANGTON GURNEY.

Emgwali.

[1] Just as here the Greek and Hebrew idioms are in 2 Mac 1^{10} the Greek and Roman idioms combined (χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν), as has been pointed out, *e.g.*, by G. Rawlinson in the *Speaker's Commentary*.

The Revisers' Greek Text of Acts v. 32.

THE A.V. has had, 'And we are his witnesses of these things'; the R.V. omits 'his,' giving, 'And we are witnesses of these things,' with the marginal note to witnesses—

'Some ancient authorities add *in him*.'

Palmer prints as the text supposed underlying the R.V.—

καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν [v-ν] μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων,

with the variant—

[v] add αὐτοῦ, A.S.; ἐν αὐτῷ, M.

To *the same result leads* us the edition of Scrivener: he prints as text of the A.V., καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες, with the apparat—

Om. αὐτοῦ text, but marg. has ἐν αὐτῷ.

But surely both Palmer and Scrivener mislead us about the marginal reading, as I was misled by them and by its English text when I prepared the Greek Testament for the B.F.B.S., and was mistaken about Tregelles when I rearranged the note in the critical apparatus of Scrivener. As Professor Schmiedel points out to me, it must run—

ἐν αὐτῷ μάρτυρές ἐσμεν L; ἐν αὐτῷ μάρτυρες Tr marg., WHmarg., Rmarg. *vel* ἐσμεν αὐτῷ μάρτυρες WHmarg.,

with other words: Tregelles, as well as the margin of the Revisers, does not wish to insert ἐν αὐτῷ *after* ἐσμεν, but to read it *instead* of ἐσμεν, as does WH marg. in the first place. For if we turn to Tischendorf or any critical apparatus, we find that ἐν αὐτῷ without ἐσμεν is attested by B, while for ἐσμεν ἐν αὐτῷ not a single MS. is quoted, and only three for ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμεν. If the R.V. had been quite correct, it would have put in the margin: Some authorities read, We *are* witnesses in Him (*are* to be printed in italics).

It is but Weymouth, who in this verse was correct as far as Tregelles, giving ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτ. (—ἐσμεν), Trm., WHm.; the marginal reading of the Revisers Weymouth identifies with Lachmann's reading:

ἐν αὐτῷ μαρτ. ἐσμεν, LRm.

As a retranslation of the English of the Revisers this is correct, but it is contrary to their list of Greek readings. But how runs their *original* list? Who can and will inspect it? EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

1 Kings iv. 31.

IN his epoch-making study of Græco-Egyptian religious literature (*Poimandres*; Leipzig, 1904), R. Reitzenstein incidentally points out (p. 163) that Dardanus, the mythical ancestor of the Trojans, and famous in legend as the founder of the Samothracian Mysteries, came to be associated, about the time of Augustus, with the magical literature of Egypt. He adds, in a note, that the legendary lore of Jewish magic had also appropriated his name, and as evidence of an alleged contest in this sphere between Dardanus and Solomon, he quotes Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 43): ὑπερῆρε δὲ καὶ διήνεγκε σοφίᾳ καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν δόξαν ἐχόντων παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπὶ δεινότητι . . . ἦσαν δὲ Ἄθανος καὶ Αἱμανὸς καὶ Χάλκεος καὶ Δάρδανος υἱοὶ Ἡμάωνος (ed. Niese). He further refers for a mention of Dardanus to a famous magical Papyrus in Paris, containing Jewish, Greek, and Oriental elements. Apparently he did not observe that Josephus, according to his regular practice in the *Antiquities*, presents at this point a close parallel to 1 K 4^{31} (5^{11} in Heb.): 'He was wiser than all men; than Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman, and Calcol and Darda, the sons of Mahol.' These names occur, with some interesting variations, in 1 Ch 2^{6}, in a genealogy of the descendants of Judah: 'And the sons of Zerah; Zimri, and Ethan, and Heman, and Calcol, and Dara.' In the Kings-passage, the LXX reads: καὶ ἐσοφίσατο ὑπὲρ Γαιθὰν τὸν Ζαρείτην καὶ τὸν Αἰνὰν καὶ τὸν Χαλκὰδ καὶ Δαραδά, υἱὸς Μάλ (so B). A has as variants: Εζραηλιτην, τον Δαραα, νιους Μαουλ. In 1 Ch $15^{17.\ 19}$, Ethan and Heman appear as Levites, directing the musical service in the temple, and in chap. 25^{1}, the names of Heman and Jeduthun (whom Burney identifies with Ethan, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings*, p. 51) are found in the same connexion. It is also worth noting that

Ps 88 is ascribed to Heman the Ezrahite, and Ps 89 to Ethan the Ezrahite. It is quite probable that Ezrahite means 'son of Zerah,' but obviously there is some confusion as to the genealogy of these famous men. Keil (*ad loc.*) holds that the description 'sons of Mahol' applies only to Calcol and Darda, whose names occur in no other passage. Obscurity attaches to this description also. For Mahol may be a proper name, or it may mean 'dance,' and hence Hiller (quoted by Keil) takes the expression בְּנֵי מָחוֹל as equivalent to *sacras choreas ducendi periti*. I have pointed out that Dardanus was, in the legends of magical tradition, connected with mystical religious rites. For in the East theology and magic were intimately related.

In his paraphase of 1 K 4^{31} was Josephus influenced by Hellenistic tradition in his introduction of the name Dardanus into a passage extolling the wisdom of Solomon, who was unquestionably regarded as a magician by later Jewish legend? Or is it possible that he was justified in this interpretation of דַּרְדַּע, a name whose etymology seems altogether doubtful? It ought to be observed that the mention of these wise men is prefaced by the words: 'Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east, and all the wisdom of Egypt.' Burney (*loc. cit.*) notes that this latter phrase refers to 'men of the priestly class who employed themselves in the study of hieroglyphics, astronomy, and magic.' May the occurrence of the name in 1 Kings point to the early influence of external tradition, and afford a preliminary hint of that Hellenizing of Judaism which was to be so important a factor in the history of culture and religion? If this be so, the phenomenon may be suggestive for the problems of source-criticism in 1 Kings.

H. A. A. Kennedy.
New College, Edinburgh.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. F. Holmes Bedford, Woodsetton.

Illustrations for the Great Text for December must be received by the 1st of November. The text is Ps 126^{6}.

The Great Text for January is Ps 139^{7}:

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'

A copy of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, or Kennett's *Early Ideals of Righteousness*, together with any volume of the 'Epoch Makers' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Is 28^{16}—'Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts,' or Durell's *The Self-Revelation of Our Lord*, or Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for March is Ro 15^{4}—'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.' A copy of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for April is Is 30^{15}—'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.' A copy of Professor Clarke's *The Ideal of Jesus*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Professor Kirsopp Lake of Leiden has written a book on *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (Rivingtons; 16s. net). It is a book of unusual beauty as well as strength. It reminds us of the work of his great predecessor, Kuenen. As characteristic of the book, and as representative of the freest modern criticism, let us look at the section in which Professor Lake discusses the authenticity of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Ever since the modern criticism of the Pauline Epistles began, the authorship of Second Thessalonians has been in doubt. The tide of opinion has ebbed and flowed. There has never been a unanimous opinion against the Pauline authorship; nor has there been a unanimous opinion in favour of it, as in the case of the First Epistle. Professor Lake reduces the real arguments against the Pauline authorship to two. One is the argument that the Apocalyptic passage in the second chapter refers to events which occurred later than the life of St. Paul, or that it is at any rate inconsistent with the eschatological teaching of the First Epistle. The other is that the style of the Second Epistle is different from that of the First, and especially that it seems to be addressed to a different community.

Each argument is in two parts. Is the eschatology of the Second Epistle different from that of the First? The objection is that in the First Epistle St. Paul describes the Parousia as imminent; in the Second he protests against the belief that 'the day of the Lord is at hand' (ἐνέστηκε). In this part of the argument, says Professor Lake, there is nothing. The Apostle does not deny that the Parousia is 'at hand'; what he denies is that it 'has come'—for that is the meaning of the word (ἐνέστηκε) which he uses.

The other part of this argument is more substantial. It is maintained that the second chapter of the Second Epistle contains the so-called Nero Saga, and the Nero Saga is of later date than the Apostle Paul. What is the Nero Saga?

When Nero died in 68 A.D., the first feeling on the part of the people was joy over their deliverance; the next was fear that the news was too good to be true. Pretenders took advantage of that fear. Within a year of his death one man appeared claiming that he was Nero. Eleven years later another came, and was acknowledged by Artabanus, the king of the Parthians. And yet another impostor in 88 almost succeeded in raising a revolt against Domitian. After 88 the death of Nero was accepted. But now the idea was conceived that he would rise again from the dead, and would lead the armies of the East against Rome.

Last of all, Nero lost his personality, became identified in the minds of the Christians with Antichrist, and so passed into the region of supernaturalism, this Neronic Antichrist being half-human and half-diabolic.

Now it has been contended, and for a time it was believed, that the Nero Saga, or legend, was the source of the whole Antichrist idea. And as the Antichrist idea is evident in Second Thessalonians, the conclusion was inevitable that Second Thessalonians was later than St. Paul. 'This argument,' says Professor LAKE, 'or something like it, certainly played a great part in the commentaries on Second Thessalonians in the nineteenth century. But it is unnecessary to discuss it in detail, because W. BOUSSET to his many services to the study of the New Testament has added this, that he has shown the true history of the Antichrist legend to be independent of the Nero Saga, and far older than the time of St. Paul.'

But the second argument against the authenticity of the Epistle remains. For a time, after the issue of BOUSSET'S *The Antichrist Legend*, opinion ran strongly in favour of the Pauline authorship. In 1903, however, this opinion was checked and reversed by the late Professor WREDE. For in that year WREDE published an extremely able monograph on Second Thessalonians (*Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs*), in which he admitted that the Apocalyptic argument had been done to death, but contended that a comparison of the literary style of the two Epistles made common authorship impossible.

It is not that the mere language is so different. The language is not different; it is strikingly alike in both. It is that there is a vast gulf between the tone of the one Epistle and that of the other. WREDE laid most stress upon these two points: (1) First Thessalonians is full of the deepest and most heartfelt sympathy and friendship; Second Thessalonians is much cooler, and, as it were, more official in tone. (2) First Thessalonians seems to imply a purely Gentile community, while Second Thessalonians shows no trace of Gentile thought, and contains no reference to anything implying Gentile origin, but, on the contrary, has a strongly Jewish colouring, with perhaps a more clearly marked resemblance to the thought and language of the Old Testament than any book in the New Testament, except the Apocalypse.

It is easily seen that the force of this argument lies in its second part. Warmer or colder is a matter of the reader's as well as of the author's mind; and there might be good reasons for the change of temperature of which we have no account. But it is not possible that between the writing of the First and the Second Epistles the community could have changed from Gentile to Jew. WREDE accordingly suggested that 'we ought to regard the Second Epistle as the work of some unknown writer, who found that the Thessalonians were too much imbued with an immediate expectation of the Parousia, and therefore wrote a warning that the Parousia could not come before the Antichrist, of whom, it is implied, no sign had yet been seen, while in order to secure attention for his warning he surrounded it in a mosaic of Pauline phraseology from First Thessalonians, and issued it as an Epistle of St. Paul.'

But now comes Professor HARNACK. Recently to the Berlin Academy Professor HARNACK read a paper on the authenticity of Second Thessalonians. He held it proved by WREDE that the two Epistles could not have been written at the same time by the same man to the same community. But he examined the circumstances of the Church at Thessalonica more carefully than even WREDE had done; and he came to the conclusion that there were two communities in it. There was a Gentile community, to whom the First Epistle was addressed, and there was a Jewish community, to whom the Second was directed.

The evidence is not very evident, but Professor HARNACK is at his best in finding and using it.

In the first place, he notices that St. Paul adjures the recipients of the First Epistle to see that it is read by all the Christians. In the immediately preceding verse there seems to be a similar emphasis on the idea of *all* the brethren. It appears, therefore, to Professor HARNACK that St. Paul was aware of a division at Thessalonica which justified the fear that his letter would not be read to all the community unless he insisted on it. Now the First Epistle was addressed to Gentile Christians; who could the minority be whom he wished to reach if not Jewish Christians? But the Jewish Christians would not be satisfied with the first epistle, in which there was nothing that could be particularly agreeable to them. Therefore, immediately after the first, the Apostle dispatched a second epistle for the special benefit of the Jewish Christians.

There is another small item of evidence. In 2 Thess. 2^{13} St. Paul says: 'We are bound to give thanks to God alway for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God chose you from the beginning unto salvation.' But that is only one rendering of a doubtful word. The textual evidence is about equally balanced between 'from the beginning' (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς), and 'as a first-fruit' (ἀπαρχήν).

But how could the Thessalonians be regarded as a first-fruit? The expression does not seem true to history in any sense, for neither were they St. Paul's earliest converts nor even were they the first in Macedonia. Interpreters have accordingly preferred to see a reference to predestination in the passage. But if Professor HARNACK's suggestion is followed, the matter appears in a new light. For the Jewish Christians in Thessalonica were, according to the Acts, the first-fruits of St. Paul's preaching in that city, though they were soon surpassed in numbers by the Gentile converts.

Professor HARNACK's theory is open to some objections. He himself admits it. Nevertheless to Professor LAKE it seems to be far more acceptable than any other which has yet been put forward. And 'whereas before its publication the balance of argument seemed to be in favour of some such hypothesis as that of WREDE, and against the authenticity of Second Thessalonians, the situation is now reversed, and there is sufficient justification for accepting the Epistle as a genuine document belonging, together with First Thessalonians, even if not so certainly, to the earliest period of Christian life in Thessalonica.'

We have said that the discussion of the authenticity of Second Thessalonians is characteristic of Professor Kirsopp LAKE's book on *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul.* But that discussion is chiefly literary. Now there is another element in the book, which to the author himself is more than all the literary discussions in it. And it is, in any case, so important and so significant of the change that has passed over the study of the New Testament, that we may say something about it.

In the Preface to his book Professor LAKE tells us that two main types of problems have been attacked in it. In the first place, an effort has been made to deal with those literary and critical questions which concern the integrity, destination, and history of the Epistles. It is of that we have seen an example. But in the second place, attention has been given to the world of religious thought to which the earliest Gentile Christians belonged—the world of the Hellenistic Mystery Religions.

This, says Professor LAKE, is a much more difficult inquiry than the other, but it is also much more important. He charges students of the New Testament with having been somewhat slow to grasp its importance, or to make use of the rich material which has been provided by classical and archæological scholars, such as CUMONT and REITZENSTEIN. 'Nevertheless I have no fear but that the immediate future will make good the remissness of the past. The study of the religious

life of the Græco-Roman world as a whole is now fully recognized to be absolutely necessary if we do not wish our notions about early Christianity to be a mere caricature of the truth.'

These words are very weighty. And to the present writer they are very grateful. For it is some years since he saw the necessity of full and sympathetic study of the religions of the world (not of Greece and Rome only, but also of the East, and even of the most primitive tribes), if the study of the New Testament was to retain its freshness and go forward. It was on that account that he projected THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, of which the fourth volume is about to be issued.

And it is not only the study of Religion that is necessary. The study of Psychology and of Ethics is scarcely less necessary. On this also Professor LAKE has a word to say. 'There is one subsidiary point to which I have drawn attention in more than one chapter, and desire to emphasize once more,—the psychological aspect of religion. To understand the history of religions, we must understand the psychology of religious men. I have endeavoured in the following pages to use what knowledge of psychology I possess, but I am confident that this method ought to be extended far more widely. The difficulty is due to our ignorance of co-ordinated facts, and this again is partly caused by the unnatural limitation of the modern study of theology.'

'We desire'—let the last words of this memorable Preface be quoted also—'We desire,' says Professor LAKE, 'to arrive at an intelligent understanding of religion; we grow old and weary in the study of texts and inscriptions, and we do well, for they have much to teach us; but we forget that religion is to be found in men, not in manuscripts, and we need to take a lesson from our brothers the doctors. They are the students of the body, as we are of the soul; they make the centre of their work the study of the body as it is found here and now, and their use of the books of past generations is always subsidiary to that study. It is the fatal mistake of the theologian to think that he can do otherwise, and understand the soul from the study of ancient books. Our great need at present is the study of the living soul, and I venture to say this, because it is, among other more important things, very necessary for the study of those Epistles on which I am writing.'

It has happened to few men to be both so overrated and so underrated as Dr. William Porcher DUBOSE has been. The reason is not far to seek. His style of writing is very difficult. He has written many books. Those who have read them are glad to hope that they have not spent their labour in vain. Those who have not taken the trouble to read them are easily persuaded that it is not worth the trouble.

His latest book is *The Reason of Life* (Longmans; 5s. net). It is not an attractive title. And it is not an attractive book. For the greater part it moves along the verses of the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel. But it moves at will, and its movements are often unexpected. No doubt it would be difficult for any man to give us a philosophy of life, after the straitest sect of the modernists, and yet cleave close to the prologue of St. John's Gospel. But few men could make it so difficult as does Dr. DUBOSE.

In the end of the book he has left St. John's Gospel, and become easier to follow. The last chapter has the very familiar title of 'Theology and Ethics.' It discusses a phrase which is also very familiar now, the cry 'Back to Christ.' And the discussion of that phrase brings out a serious mistake which popular theology has fallen into, and at the same time shows Dr. DUBOSE in his most acceptable manner.

Dr. DUBOSE does not claim that he has made a discovery. A discovery has been made, but it

belongs to another. Quite frankly he says that his final chapter 'is based upon a recent work, *The Ethics of St. Paul*, by Archibald B. D. ALEXANDER M.A. (Glasgow).' 'With that work as a whole,' he adds, 'as the best and completest exposition I know of the ethical teaching and system of St. Paul, I am in entire accord. Now, however, I desire to lay even additional emphasis upon a particular point, which the author himself makes much of.'

This is the point. In his Preface Mr. ALEXANDER quotes the saying from somebody, that 'for many thinkers St. Paul is as obsolete as Tertullian or Calvin.' Dr. DUBOSE quotes it after him, and does not deny it. The reason of it, he says, is that the theology which these 'many thinkers' attribute to St. Paul is not St. Paul's. In what respect is it not St. Paul's? It is unethical and even immoral. St. Paul's theology is an insistent demand for personal righteousness at every step.

You will find, says Dr. DUBOSE, a statement of the true ethical Paulinism in Mr. ALEXANDER'S *Ethics of St. Paul*. You will find a statement of the popular doctrinal—unethical and therefore un-Pauline—Paulinism in the late Professor WREDE'S *Paulus*. Dr. DUBOSE has read the *Paulus*. What he has to say about it is based on a knowledge of the whole of it. And what he has to say is this. WREDE finds St. Paul in complete contradiction to Jesus. 'The preaching of Jesus is direct and imperative: man is to submit his soul to God's will without reserve: the condition of his salvation is obedience: it is simply a matter of personal (human) decision.' But 'the central point with Paul is a divine action (or complex of actions, the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of a divine being), which opens to mankind a salvation prepared for man: he who believes these divine acts can obtain salvation.'

So WREDE. Dr. DUBOSE says that WREDE has made two mistakes. First, he has taken the work of the Pauline Christ as the work of an entirely and exclusively celestial, superhuman, or divine person. And, next, he has assumed that the acts of Christ are represented by St. Paul as in no proper sense our own acts, but acts that are done for us by one who remains external to us.

Now Dr. DUBOSE is prepared to assert that even the Incarnation is never represented as exclusively a divine act. 'The Word became flesh and dwelt among us.' That is true. It is also true that the flesh accepted the Word. If humanity had not willed that the Word should become flesh, if man had not in the exercise of the freedom of his will, opened his humanity to the indwelling of God, then Dr. DUBOSE is prepared to say that God would not and could not have become man. He is prepared to say that that is the theology of St. Paul.

The Rev. J. G. SIMPSON, D.D., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's, has published a volume of sermons to which he has given the title of *The Spirit and the Bride* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is the third volume of sermons which Canon SIMPSON has published. And in the Introduction to this volume he draws our attention to the fact that the three volumes are related to one another.

For in the apprehension of Jesus as Lord, there are, he says, three stages. These stages correspond roughly to the knowledge of Christ gained by the Apostles during His earthly ministry, to their realization of the significance of the Passion, and to their experience of the Pentecostal life. The three volumes accordingly follow the order of these three stages. The first volume deals chiefly with our Lord's character and teaching. The sermons in the second volume are almost entirely occupied with His redemptive work, consummated on the Cross. The volume just published begins with Christ's exaltation, touches the coming of the Spirit, glances at the Church and the Sacraments, and then is mainly given up to an account of the Christian life and the Christian witness.

This manner of preaching is not new. But it seems as if for some time it had been forgotten. It is only within the last year or two that one has observed a tendency to return to it. The most unmistakable example of it, and it is a striking one, is Dr. MACGREGOR'S first volume in the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, *Jesus the Son of God*. In that volume every sermon can be read by itself with no uncomfortable feeling that it is not complete. But it is only when the whole volume is read that the full value of each separate sermon is obtained. So also with Dr. SIMPSON'S volumes, though perhaps not quite so impressively. Here also we realize the advantage which the regular hearer has over the occasional, and how easy it is to receive from the pulpit systematic instruction in doctrine and life without the sacrifice of expectation or the interest which attaches to the unknown.

Canon SIMPSON follows the three stages of approach to God. Every man who calls Jesus Lord has come to Him at one or other of those three stages in His ministry. He has been attracted by the beauty of Christ's character. Or he has been arrested by the conviction of sin and found peace, like Bunyan's Christian, at the foot of the Cross. Or he has recognized the presence of the Spirit, and the power the Spirit gives for righteousness, whether in his own life or in the life of the Christian community around him.

At the present time Canon SIMPSON thinks that men are most attracted by the character and words of the human Jesus. It is characteristic of the present age, he says, with its remarkable appreciation of social problems and its yearnings for an ethical ideal and an inspiration of human brotherhood, to 'come and see' in the spirit of the enthusiastic Peter, or the guileless Nathanael, whether this be indeed the Messiah. Fresh from the annual gathering at Swanwick, organized by the Student Christian Movement, he sees clearly enough that it is on this side that the most eager approach is made to Christ by young men in our day. But these annual gatherings have impressed him with another thing.

The men who are drawn to Christ in this way are never quite content. They rarely fail to see that in the Gospels, as well as in the Epistles, the chief emphasis is laid not upon Christ's character but upon His work, not upon what He was but upon what He did. And they often realize, with something like consternation, that it is the work Christ came to do, and did, that has given Him His unique place in the world, His unique power over the heart and conscience. To put this in the language of modern theological inquiry, they are seeking for the true connecting link between the Jesus of history and the Christ of experience.

Canon SIMPSON is entirely in sympathy with this uneasiness. He recognizes the power of that discipleship to which Jesus is presented as a heroic, prophetic, and withal intensely human personality. But at the same time he recognizes its inadequacy to effect that incorporation into the very spirit and life of Christ which is the characteristic experience of the Christian. For it is not enough that Christ should be an illustration in history, He must be a Divine presence in whom we live and move and have our being. Where is the link to be found that will unite the human Jesus with the Divine Christ? 'We claim,' says Canon SIMPSON, 'that the true and only link is provided for us in the interpretation which the New Testament sets upon the Passion.'

For it is not enough that Christ should simply show forth the beauty of His own character. That would be no explanation of His life. It would be no explanation of the life of any one. Men do not act in order to reveal themselves. They do not act in their social relations merely or even primarily to manifest their love. This they inevitably do, their actions being simply accepted as pledges of what they themselves are. They act for the purpose of accomplishing something. They act with some end in view. One man is a teacher,

another writes books on science, or history, or philosophy, a third is a social reformer. Each man has come to do something. What he does no doubt reveals his character, but what we ask about him is, What did he come to do, and what has he done?

That is what we ask about Christ. He Himself encouraged us. His final answer to every question about Himself was this, that 'the Son of man came to give his life a ransom.' Canon SIMPSON is right when he says: 'It is entirely false to the proportions alike of the Synoptic Gospels and of St. John to regard the Crucifixion as other than the climax of the whole story, the goal of all the efforts of the Son of Man.'

Of St. John, says Canon SIMPSON, as well as of the Synoptics. And, as if in answer to an objection, he selects the Fourth Gospel for the purpose of proving the centrality of the Cross as the triumphant achievement of the life of Christ, although he says it might be freely illustrated from every book of the New Testament. He selects the Fourth Gospel because there seems to be a tendency to miss the real scope and purpose of that great writing. People talk as though the object of this 'story of a disciple's faith' were merely to select such episodes in the evangelical story as in his judgment made it unmistakably clear that Jesus was the only begotten God, and that in consequence a series of seven works of power were chosen as illustrations of this one theme. It is even argued that a gospel the very purpose of which was to emphasize, in opposition to gnostic heresy, the reality of the Incarnation, and in which the thirst, the tears, the affections, the wistfulness, the mortality of Jesus, are all conspicuous, allows the humanity almost to disappear in contemplation of the Godhead. 'So far is this from being the case that, as at least it seems to me, there is no ground for supposing that the Fourth Gospel ever separates the idea of the manifestation of God in Christ from the redeeming work of the Son of man. This becomes still more evident when the gospel is read in the light of the First Epistle.'

But there are two things quite easily apprehended and sufficient of themselves to keep us right regarding the scope of the Fourth Gospel. The first thing is its Prologue.

How much does the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel cover? It covers, says Dr. SIMPSON, not less than the first eighteen verses. It will not do, therefore, to say that the thesis of the Gospel is the statement that the Word became flesh and we beheld His glory, and thereupon conclude that the writer intended simply to reveal the Divine character of Christ. For observe that the glory is the glory of grace and truth. It is the glory of grace as well as the glory of truth. Now in the Fourth Gospel, as in St. Paul, grace is related to the redeeming work. 'He came unto his own home, and his own people received him not.' Here is His rejection; here is His cross. It is all included in the Incarnation. The writer now turns and looks at the same series of events as a Divine activity, wrought out on behalf of believers. As many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become children of God. Here is the recovered status of 'them that believe on his name.' It is exactly what St. Paul means by 'the grace wherein we stand through faith in Jesus.' Then this recovered Sonship is seen to involve a new birth. It is 'not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,' a condition which is intimately related in the First Epistle to the propitiation for sins. It is only when all this has been said that we reach the declaration 'the Word became flesh.'

The other thing is the writer's own experience. There is a thread of personal experience, says Canon SIMPSON, which is not always noticed, but which nevertheless binds together and gives unity to the successive episodes which the writer chooses in order to illustrate his theme. The words of the Baptist, uttered in the hearing of 'two of his

disciples,' may be regarded as the text of the gospel: 'Behold the Lamb of God.' The note of this utterance is struck again and again throughout the book. If it is not present in the story of the marriage at Cana, it is prominent in that of the cleansing of the Temple. It meets us in the conversation with Nicodemus, when we read of the Brazen Serpent, with its commentary, 'God so loved the world.' The thought is present in Christ's hard saying about His flesh and blood, and in the similitude of the corn of wheat. Caiaphas is described as having 'prophesied that Jesus should die.' It may be assumed that the idea of sacrificial consecration breathes through the narrative of the Upper Room and the Last Discourses. And the two most striking features in this Evangelist's account of the death of Jesus are the emphasis with which he records his conviction of its reality and the unexpected analogy which he draws between the unbroken legs of the dead Christ and the wholeness of the paschal lamb. We seem to hear an echo of the Baptist's announcement, 'Behold, the Lamb of God!'

And thus Canon SIMPSON concludes that of St. John's Gospel, as indeed of the whole of the New Testament, the main interest is the Cross. And what is the Cross? Is it a redeeming God accomplishing the redemption of men by laying His stripes upon a human victim? No, it is a redeeming God, Himself sacramentally present and accepting every stripe, and in the acceptance of it accomplishing the redemption. Jesus bears His cross, is stretched upon it, receives the vinegar, yields up His spirit. The soldier pierces His side. The body is laid in the tomb. But beneath the outward submission there is a conflict, as final as it is fierce: 'Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the Prince of this world be cast out.' The Evangelist recalls the familiar passage of Isaiah. He is led as a lamb to the slaughter, but at the same moment He bears the iniquities of His people.

The Sealed Book of the Apocalypse.

BY THE REV. F. W. WORSLEY, M.A., B.D., CAMBRIDGE.

THE great Christian Apocalypse is admittedly one of the most difficult books to interpret; and yet it seems at times as though commentators went out of their way to make it less easy to be understood. The vision which is described in chaps. 4–8[1], gives us the opening act in the drama proper, all that has gone before is of the nature of a prologue. The present general mode of treatment breaks up this vision into a series of disjointed scenes, which do not seem to have any particular connexion with each other, unless we exercise considerable subtlety. Such treatment, of course, favours the current partition theories. With these we have not now to deal, but it seems probable that, even if we accept such theories, the final editor must have had some definite plan in his head, and the interpretation of the whole must depend very considerably upon the meaning that we attach to this first act.

Let us take first, quite briefly, the interpretations which are offered with regard to this vision.

In dealing with the sealed book (*βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσωθεν καὶ ὄπισθεν, κατεσφραγισμένον σφραγῖσιν ἑπτά*), it is of no great moment whether it took the form of a codex (as Spitta supposes) or of a papyrus roll. Nor need we go to the Roman legal requirements with regard to the sevenfold sealing of a will (as do Zahn, J. Weiss, Hicks, and others) in order to explain the symbolism. The chief point is that the seals could only be opened by the Lamb.

We are told that the book is 'the book of doom' (Moffatt); that it is a book having for its contents the judgements of God, 'the things which are to be hereafter,' which are successively displayed through the successive opening of the seals (Anderson Scott); that 'it is the book of Destiny' (Swete); and so forth. There is a similar unanimity

in interpreting the seals. 'With the breaking of the first four, the Parthian invader, the sword of Rome, famine and pestilence are let loose upon the world' (Jülicher, *Einl.* p. 262). Professor Ramsay (*Letters to the Seven Churches*, p. 58) says that the bow in the hand of the first horseman points to the Parthians, and nearly all commentators follow him; though Weizsäcker, Spitta, and Renan see four individuals portrayed in the four horsemen, probably the first four Roman emperors. Erbes is more independent; he sees in the four seals events which touched nearly the primitive Church under these emperors. The sword in the hand of the second horseman is fixed upon as symbolizing the Roman power, which is thus set side by side with the Parthians, and as the result of the consequent conflict comes, in the third seal, 'the spectral figure of hunger,' who 'holds a balance or pair of scales' (Moffatt).

A still further result is seen at the opening of the fourth seal, in the advent of Death and his grim companion, Hades.

The following seal, the fifth, discloses the souls of the waiting saints, who cry out their longing for vengeance; these 'are consoled by the promise of the approaching day of Judgement' (Jülicher).

The sixth seal forms a little apocalypse by itself, similar to that in the Synoptic Gospels (Mk 13, and parallels). It does not seem to have much connexion with the foregoing, if we accept the interpretations given; it is generally supposed to be the beginning of the end. Chap. 7 presents us with an interlude; it is a vision of the redeemed which falls into two distinct divisions. Consequently a great difficulty is felt by the critics. Vischer, Bousset, Wellhausen, and others set down the first eight verses as a Jewish fragment which has been made use of by the editor, while Völter and J. Weiss trace it to a Jewish-Christian source. The second half of the chapter is manifestly Christian, and is said to rise far above its setting. The seventh seal produces a silence in heaven 'about the space of half an hour,' which is obviously meant to suggest 'a breathless suspense.'

The question that we are constrained to ask is, is there anything really intelligible in all this? If this vision be a mere conglomeration of separate scraps culled from a hundred differing sources, we should not, perhaps, ask too much in this direction. And yet the final editor must have intended something that had more point than this almost meaningless riddle. Had it no definite message for the oppressed souls to whom the Apocalypse was addressed? Surely we must take the whole vision as being a connected and homogeneous whole. Wherefore we go on to ask more questions. What possible connexion is there between the twofold picture of heavenly worship in chaps. 4, 5 on the one hand, and the quarrels of the Romans and Parthians on the other? Were famine and bloodshed, consequent upon war, entirely new phenomena that they needed to be thus solemnly set forth? Why was it that 'the Lion of the tribe of Judah' could alone open the seals which disclosed the coming conflict? Any student of contemporary history could have foretold in these very general terms the possibility of such a conflict, together with its inevitable hardships and sufferings.

If we go back to the theory of the ancient expositors, we shall find that a far more workable system of interpretation is presented. Hippolytus says ἔλαβεν οὖν τὸ βιβλίον καὶ ἔλυσεν, ἵνα τὰ πάλαι περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀποκρύφως λαλούμενα νῦν μετὰ παρρησίας ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων κηρυχθῇ.

Viewed in this way we shall take the incidents in chap. 12 as meaning the birth of Jesus, and thus regard all that is spoken of prior to that in the Apocalypse as antecedent to it in point of time. In the seals, therefore, the apocalyptist sees the gradual unfolding of the plan of God from the foundation of the world. The seven-sealed book is thus the book of human history during the old dispensation, the writing of the finger of God upon the papyrus roll of human life. To the uninstructed this forms a sealed book. Trial, tribulation, suffering, war, famine, bloodshed, all are writ large upon the oft-turned page. Generation after generation had asked, what is the meaning of it all? How is it compatible with the righteousness of God? Apocalyptic literature had endeavoured in past ages to answer the question, and had succeeded at least in allaying to some extent the uneasiness that was abroad by creating new hopes. Now all is viewed in a new light. Jesus alone can open the seals and give an adequate answer to the problem. He it is who can show the Divine Purpose in it all, for He is the fulfilment of all.

The Vision begins, then, with the pre-Christian worship of Yahweh. The earth is full of troubles and fightings and fears, but the heavenly worship of the One Almighty is continuous, serene and

confident in the full realization that the Will of the Creator was being worked out in the apparent pandemonium. This is followed by the revelation of the secret. It is to be found in Jesus alone. He, who alone is able, opens the first seal (6^1), and the rider on the white horse comes forth. The Roman triumph has nothing to do with the symbolism (*pace* Mr. Scott), for on those occasions the conquering general rode in a chariot. That the colour of the horse and the giving of the crown betoken triumph is actually stated in v.^{2}. We see here man, newly created, going forth, armed with his primitive weapon, to assert his supremacy over all created things (Gn $1^{26.\ 28}$). No other suggestion fits the simple description as well as this. The thought of Messiah is quite out of the question, since the Lamb had just opened the seal. Such a confusion of ideas is unthinkable. The only possible reference to the Parthian is the bow. But there is nothing at all to suggest the raids of this traditional foe to the Roman arms. Rather do the few words betoken a radiant serenity, such as appears in the first two chapters of Genesis. Nor is this figure unconnected with that seen upon the white horse in the vision of 19^{11}. Man, having originally gone forth as a conqueror, failed to sustain the *rôle*, the 'superman' therefore comes forth also upon a white horse, to succeed gloriously where the other had signally failed.

The next three seals set forth the baneful results consequent upon such failure. The first discordant element appears with the opening of the second seal, it is the commencement of bloodshed. To the rider upon the red horse it was given 'to take peace from the earth, and (to cause men) to slay one another' (λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἵνα ἀλλήλους σφάξουσιν). Had bloodshed never been heard of before? Or was war an innovation? Why was the Lamb to be thus personally identified with any imminent fighting between the Romans and the Parthians? The first appearance of bloodshed upon the earth, on the other hand, did need explanation. And since Abel was considered a type of Jesus, and since Jesus had Himself spoken of 'the blood of Abel,' it might quite well have been considered that even so terrible a catastrophe as this, with its horrible consequences for the race, was turned to account in the slowly unfolding purpose of the heavenly Father.

As to the third seal, is it so certain that famine prices are intended? In general Greek usage it is true that the χοῖνιξ was a measure equal to two pints. But in Ezk 45^{10} the word is used in the LXX as a translation of בַּת, which means some sixty or seventy pints. In the A.V. the word 'measure' is used in a very vague sense; in the O.T. it is put for *ephah*, *kor*, *seah*, and in the N.T. for βάτος, κόρος, σάτον, and, in this passage, for χοῖνιξ. May not this last Greek word have been used in much the same vague way? The Ezekiel passage inclines one to think so. It may be said that the black horse suggests the idea of mourning; but as black is significant of death, this colour would more properly belong to the horse of the fourth rider, or even that of the second, if such a thought were intended. The horses are taken from Zec $6^{2.\ 3}$, and thus the black horse may have some reference here also to the 'north country.' We may take this figure as symbolic of traffic, and to speak of the rise of commerce. Even if it be insisted that it points to famine resultant upon war, it would refer rather to the time when these terrors began to be known than to the time of the writer.

That there is a reference in the concluding words to the 'futile fiscal attempt' of Domitian in 92 A.D. is certainly 'attractive' (Moffatt, *Expositor*, October 1908, p. 368; see also *Expositor's Greek Test.* ad. loc.), but the objection of Schürer (*Theol. Lit.* 1906, p. 258), on the ground that the mention of the oil is out of keeping with the whole suggestion, seems to be insuperable.

The opening of the fourth seal reveals Death and his fellow, Hades. If we accept the vision as portraying events which are future for the apocalyptist, we must suppose that there is to be a great increase in mortality among men. But if this be the meaning, what is the significance of 'the beasts of the earth'? Surely this points to primitive times; or are we to be ultra-imaginative and hear in these words an echo of the cry 'Christiani ad leones'? If we suppose that the seer is adopting the earliest possible standpoint and that he thus looks forward into the developments of history, we can quite understand his reference to the entry of death into the world, which works its havoc among men through the 'four sore judgements' of Ezk 14^{21}. Moreover, Death and Hades were the 'twin terrors' that were robbed of much of their power through the Resurrection of Jesus. Here were

things that men wished to have explained. Many were the views expressed with regard to them by the Apocalyptic writers of the past, but in Jesus was found the beautiful revelation which enlightened even the dark places of Death and Hades. Certainly He alone could open such a seal.

That a fourth part of mankind is said to be slain may perhaps be explained by the fact that one of the first little band of four is suddenly cut off, with the result that the writer perpetuates this proportion.

The fifth seal discloses a scene which is wholly Jewish in conception and setting. There is no need to make extensive quotations from Rabbinic literature to show this. It is sufficient to recall this passage from *Pirke Aboth*, 'Rabbi Akiba said: "Whosoever is buried in the land of Israel, it is as if he were buried beneath the altar; but whosoever is buried beneath the altar, it is as if he were buried beneath the throne of glory."'

The anxious cry of the waiting ones is also a pre-Christian conception. In Ps 79^{10} we read, 'Let it be made known among the nations before our eyes, the vengeance for the blood of thy servants that was poured out'; and in Zec 1^{12}, 'Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah?' Two passages from Enoch are very striking. 'I saw the spirit of a dead son of man wailing; and his voice penetrated to heaven and wailed. Then I asked the angel Michael who was with me, and said unto him, To whom does this mourning spirit belong? And he answered and said, This spirit is that which went out from Abel' (22^5). 'In those days shall the Holy Ones, who dwell above in the heavens, with one voice intercede, pray, laud, thank and praise the name of the Lord of Spirits on account of the blood of the righteous, and on account of the prayer of the righteous, that it may not be in vain before the Lord of Spirits, that the judgement may be performed for them, and its tarrying be not for ever' (47^2).

The writer must have had these Enochian passages in mind, and thus the reference to Abel is of particular interest in view of what we have said above.

Here is another proof of the fact that the seals refer to pre-Christian times. In the interlude which occupies chap. 7 we have his commentary on these waiting souls.

The sixth seal opens up the picture of a little apocalypse. There is no need to draw out in detail the way in which it all depends entirely upon the older conceptions which appear in the O.T. and in Apocalyptic literature. But we shall miss the whole point of the entire work, it seems to me, if we consider that this seal shows the great catastrophe which is the immediate preliminary of the end of all things. The details point to that, of course; but if the seal 'ushers in the end,' then the remainder of the book becomes a meaningless jumble, and the historical incidents of the later portions of the work are wholly out of place. The method of it all becomes more clear if we suppose that this seal signifies the era of Apocalyptic literature. It is the herald, not of the end, but of the coming of Messiah. Again, it is in Jesus alone that all that weird cycle of thought finds its true fulfilment and interpretation. This being so, the interlude presented in chap. 7 is not an interpolated passage made up of two incongruous fragments. It stands as a beautiful symbol of the fact that the two dispensations were merged into one in the heavenly courts. The waiting ones whom he has mentioned needed, he felt, some explanation. He proceeds to show that they are the elect of Israel, who have been set apart with a solemn sealing. To avoid any confusion arising in the minds of his readers, he goes on to speak of a vision into the more remote future when this remnant of Israel is swallowed up in 'a great multitude which no man could number out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues.' This glorious passage, one of the finest in the book, is not an isolated fragment with no reference to its context. It is the answer to that anxious cry, which had risen aforetime from the waiting saints, and which found its echo in the hearts of the readers of the Apocalypse. In point of strict chronology this second half of the chapter belonged to a later period, but the seer could no longer withhold the message of comfort, which, moreover, had a real symbolic meaning in this place.

The seventh seal is then opened. The old dispensation is completed, the new is about to commence. The half-hour's silence, therefore, has a dual significance. His readers could not fail to think of that strange phenomenon, the cessation of prophecy, which had very naturally been a source of anxious wonderment to the minds of the Jews. To them it had seemed as though Yahweh had withdrawn Himself from among them,

and, in consequence, Jewish thought came to despair of the present age. But to the seer it had a deeper significance still. The Lamb had shown in His own person the golden chain which ran through the chequered history of the past. He was now about to take His place in the drama itself, and the whole of the heavenly host is, as it were, spell-bound in awed expectation.

If we view the sealed book in this light, surely it gives a newer meaning and interest to the whole of the Apocalypse. It is seen, then, to be a solid unity, the product of one master mind. If there were any real added value to be gained from acceptance of the partition theories, or if the proof in favour of them were overwhelming, we should, of course, fall in with them. But this is far from being the case. They simply reduce the whole book to a state of chaos. The method I have suggested, which needs carrying out more fully, does not only help us to see that the work is carefully planned, and that the plan is wonderfully worked out, but its whole usefulness for the intended readers, and its whole meaning for us, is made immeasurably clearer.

And after all is said and done, that is the main point.

Literature.

RELIGION.

Canon J. A. MacCulloch, D.D., now of Bridge of Allan, has made for himself a great name as a student of Religion. His special department is the Religion of the Ancient Celts. But it is some time since he discovered that no department of knowledge can be studied in isolation. He made himself fit to write authoritatively on the Celtic religion by a preliminary and thorough study of pagan religion generally. He has now written his masterpiece; it is a handsome volume of 400 large octavo pages. The title is *The Religion of the Ancient Celts* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. net).

Now it is not in the least likely that the circulation of this book will run a race with a new novel by Marie Corelli. Yet here is an idiomatic and engaging English style; and here are men and women of like passions such as we are, with the glamour of romance thrown round them; and here in its variety and in its profundity, in the unutterable joy it brings and the inexpressible despair, is that great factor in human life called Religion.

No doubt it is a story of the past. But the religious past is always present, if the author is capable of restating it. Its hopes are the same, and even to a large extent its experiences, however diversely they may be interpreted. And is not much of the interest of these Celtic legends found in this, that the interpretation of human hopes and experiences which they offer can never be out of date, because it is so imaginative? It appeals, one might say, to the eternal child in man, and who will deny that the interpretation of the child is the most profound and the most persistent.

The answer may be made that this is not a book of poetry but of science, and therefore out of date and worthless. It is not a true answer. For, as Professor James Ward has been recently urging with insistence, science deals with generalities, whereas here we have nothing but particulars. There is no science in the book; there could not be. When the ancient Celts had finished their course, science had not yet come to the birth. It is the aim, no doubt, of the modern student of religion to show that his study is a science and to study it scientifically. But the religion of the ancient Celts can give no more than some of the particulars from which science tries to construct its general laws. Moreover, it is never possible for a man to be sure how much of actual belief lay behind a particular custom, such as the custom of never turning round after visiting a well of water, and how much of it was imaginative make-believe. The contents of this great book will therefore never be out of date; they will never cease to charm and to instruct.

Messrs. Harrap are the publishers of the 'Myths' Series. Four volumes of the series have already been issued, and here is a fifth. The new volume deals with the *Myths and Legends of the Celtic Race.* Its author is Mr. T. W. Rolleston (7s. 6d. net). Like the rest of the volumes it is thoroughly popular in manner. No knowledge whatever of the subject is necessary before reading it. But

there is a popular style which disregards science and philosophy and knows not poetry or imagination, that takes no trouble to find out the truth or to tell it truthfully when found. Mr. Rolleston has the unlearned in his mind as he writes, and he has the gift of writing for them. But that seems only to make his sense of responsibility the greater. He has succeeded in making a book which will satisfy the scholar's demand for scholarship, and may be read with pleasure by anybody. His enthusiasm for his subject is contagious.

'A brass rod is the money of by far the larger number of the people on the Lower and Upper Congo. In thickness it is not quite so stout as an ordinary slate pencil, and varies now in length, according to the tribe using it, from 5 inches long on the Lower Congo to an indefinite length among the more distant tribes of Congo's hinterland.'

Very well, the Rev. John H. Weeks of the Baptist Missionary Society has imagined a brass rod able to see, and able to describe all that it saw, as it passed from hand to hand throughout the Congo. Mr. Weeks writes pleasantly, out of a well-furnished memory, and gives us in this way an account of the most intimate matters in the life of the people. He does not neglect those trifling things which make life what it is, but which are usually passed over as beneath the dignity of history.

This forms the first part of the book. In the second part the author repeats some Congo folk-lore tales. Whatever truth there may be in the charge that missionary books are unreadable, there would be no truth whatever in it if it were made against this book. The title is *Congo Life and Folklore* (R.T.S.; 5s. net).

Students of religion will be charmed with a new volume which Messrs. Macmillan have just published in the same style as Skeat's *Malays* and Spencer and Gillen's *Australians*. Its title is *The Baganda*, its author the Rev. John Roscoe, Hon. M.A.(Cantab.), formerly of the Church Missionary Society (15s. net).

The Baganda are a people who occupy Uganda, a country which is now well known and easily reached. The long and tedious journey of 800 miles from Zanzibar to the Victoria Nyanza, through the weary waterless plains of Ugogo, with their dangers of fever or of attacks by the fierce natives—the journey which Mr. Roscoe had to make when he went to Uganda—has no longer to be undertaken by any one. There is now a comfortable railway which covers the 600 miles to the nearest point on the Victoria Nyanza in two days and two nights, while the traveller sits contentedly enjoying the scenery or refreshing himself with the excellent meals which are provided at intervals at the Dak-bungalows.

The approach to Uganda was only the beginning of Mr. Roscoe's troubles. But he is modestly reticent about the things he has himself passed through. He has written this book in order to tell us about the Baganda. He has written it with the distinct purpose of telling us about the Baganda not as they are to-day, but as they were before they came to know anything either of the Arab traders or of Christian missionaries. He brings his narrative down to the beginning of the reign of Mutesa, and ends there, because it was Mutesa that admitted the Arab trader into Uganda and also received the first missionaries.

The book is the direct fruit of the modern study of religion. Some eighteen years ago Mr. Roscoe came to know Dr. J. G. Frazer, and was instructed by him in the methods of the scientific study of religion. No doubt he was supplied with that very interesting pamphlet which Dr. Frazer has prepared and which he is willing to present to any missionary who cares to have it, a pamphlet which contains the rudiments of the science and gives the questions which should be put to natives in the search for information about their religion. He has accordingly gone about his work intelligently as well as persistently, and he acknowledges that his efforts have been most generously furthered by the authorities in Uganda, especially by Sir Apolo Kagwa, K.C.M.G., Prime Minister and Regent of Uganda, in whose house indeed most of the information was collected.

But we are more concerned with his results than with his methods. What does he learn about the religion of the Baganda? What, in particular, has he learned of their ideas about the spirits of the departed? Let us quote a paragraph.

'The belief in ghosts, both malevolent and benevolent, was firmly held by all classes, from the highest to the lowest. Existence in another form was a reality to them, and all looked forward to living and moving in the next state. The horrors of mutilation were increased by their ideas of the

after-world; for not only would the maimed person be inconvenienced and made to suffer in this life, but in the next world his ghost would in like manner be maimed. Hence the idea of amputation was so dreaded by men, that a person preferred to die with a limb rather than live without it, and so lose his chance of possessing full powers in the ghost-world. The loss of an eye was not only the sign which marked an adulterer in this life, but the loss would hold good in a future state and mark the man there; the thief who had been caught and deprived of his hand was for ever maimed, and his ghost bore the stigma of a thief; so, too, mutilation in war-time was thought to constitute a blemish in the after-world. The loss of a limb was, moreover, a disgrace, not only to the man himself, but also to his clan, and the members naturally did their utmost to avoid the infamy.'

Mr. Roscoe gives an account of all that affected the Baganda from their birth to their burial. But there is no part of his story that is more interesting than his chapter on religion, from which that paragraph is taken, and there is nothing that brings us closer to the real life of the Baganda than his account of their belief in ghosts. Let us read a little more of it, but let us first of all express our gratitude to the author for one of the most valuable books in the history of religion that have ever been published.

'Ghosts were believed to dwell in the vicinity of their old haunts; they were thought to have their pleasure grounds, and also to feel certain wants much as the living; they had their likes and dislikes, they were moved by kindness and made angry by neglect. Hence it behoved the living, and especially the relations upon whom the care and welfare of the ghosts depended, to be ever watchful for their interests; otherwise the ghosts would retaliate and cause illness and death in the clan. A favourite place of the ghosts was among the trees and plantains in the gardens, where they made sport, especially at noon when the sun shone brightly; on this account children were warned against going out to play in the gardens during the heat of the day, and even adults did not enter them at this time, unless they were obliged to do so. When the wind blew softly and murmured in the leaves of the trees, the ghosts were said to be talking to one another; and when a whirlwind occurred and carried up the dust and the leaves, the ghosts were said to be at play. Ghosts hung about the graves in which their bodies lay buried; nothing would induce them to go far away from the spot, except the removal of the body or of some particular portion of it. The special portion of the body to which a ghost clung was the lower jawbone (*lwanga*); when once this was taken away the ghost would follow it to the ends of the earth, and would be quite satisfied to remain with the jawbone if it were honoured. This supposed knowledge of the way to control a ghost has been acted upon for many years; there are jawbones of men, who lived nearly a thousand years ago, preserved to this day by members of the clan to which they belonged; and they are regarded as a most precious heirloom. The possession of the jawbone of a member of the clan would (it was thought) bring good fortune. Naturally the jawbones of kings were preserved with the utmost care, and were handed down from generation to generation, with numerous traditions.'

Professor Frazer has now been able to publish the third part of the third edition of 'The Golden Bough.' Its title is *The Dying God* (Macmillan; 10s. net).

It was the Dying God that gave 'The Golden Bough' its existence at the first. Professor Frazer was struck with the fact that the King of the Wood at Nemi had regularly to die by the hand of his successor. Why had he so to die? The book was written to answer that question. Here, then, in this volume that question is isolated and answered by itself. What is the answer that Dr. Frazer gives? He believes that the King was looked upon as an incarnation of Deity, and he understands that the motive for slaying him was the fear lest, with the enfeeblement of his body in sickness or old age, his sacred spirit should suffer a corresponding decay, which might imperil the general course of nature and with it the existence of his worshippers, who believe the cosmic energies to be mysteriously knit up with those of their human divinity.

Such an idea is remote enough from our present ways of thinking. But one does not read far into Dr. Frazer's book before discovering that even this is another of those touches of nature which make the whole world kin. That so many things came out of it will surprise no one. The surprise will be that Dr. Frazer has now been able to separate these things, and confine himself to the exposition of this one central subject.

PHILOSOPHY, PSYCHOLOGY, AND ETHICS.

i. Philosophy.

Professor James Ward of Cambridge delivered the Gifford Lectures in the University of St. Andrews in the years 1907–1910. Ten years earlier he delivered the Gifford Lectures in the University of Aberdeen. When they were published he gave the Aberdeen Giffords the title of 'Naturalism and Agnosticism.' He wishes now that he had given them the fuller title of 'The Realm of Nature, or Naturalism and Agnosticism.' For they contained just one-half of his philosophy. And if he had only known that he would afterwards be invited to state the other half at St. Andrews he would have made clear in the title of his book that the Aberdeen lectures were incomplete. Well, he has now published the other half, and he gives the volume containing it the full title of *The Realm of Ends or Pluralism and Theism* (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net).

Professor Ward is a spiritual monist. He does not believe in a philosophical dualism of any kind. Still less does he believe in a materialistic monism. This is his belief, in a single sentence and in his own words: 'Having satisfied ourselves, then, that mechanism is not the secret of the universe; that, if it is to have any meaning, it must subserve some end; and finding generally that increased knowledge of Nature's laws means increased control of Nature's processes, we accept the facts of experience in which subject and object interact, rather than the conclusions of dualism, that mind and matter are for us two alien worlds, and all knowledge of Nature an inexplicable mystery—we accept the spiritualistic standpoint and its Realm of Ends as the more fundamental.'

But he recognizes the fact that, on the first look of it, this universe is a universe of mechanical facts and forces. How does he account for that? He accounts for it simply by showing that it is only on the first look of it that the world is a world of materialism. He says: 'We may remind those who demand of us an explanation of the appearance of mechanism, that, if the term be strictly taken, there need for spiritualism be no such appearance at all. The more completely we can interpret the world as a realm of ends, the more completely the tables are turned upon naturalism. As this contends, in the words of Huxley, "for the gradual banishment from all regions of human thought of what we call spirit and spontaneity," so that, for the gradual banishment of what we call inert stuff and directionless energy.'

Professor Ward makes no claim for spiritual monism as a full and final interpretation of the Universe. 'Nobody nowadays—save here and there a man of science off his beat, like Haeckel for example—has the hardihood to rush into print with a final explanation of the Universe.' What he claims for it is that it avoids the deadlock of dualism, that it explains the facts of experience without ignoring or contradicting them as materialistic monism does, and especially that it makes for progress.

The volume arrives at a time when theologians are once more plunged into the controversy about miracles. No one should say another word on that controversy until he has read it.

The translation of *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy and published by Mr. T. N. Foulis, is now nearly complete. Six volumes have been issued this month, bringing the whole issue up to seventeen volumes in all, and leaving only one to come.

The volumes just issued are the following: (1) 'Early Greek Philosophy, and other Essays,' translated by Maximilian A. Müge (2s. 6d. net). (2) Part II. of 'Human, All-Too-Human,' translated by Paul V. Cohn, B.A. (5s. net). (3) A volume containing (*a*) 'The Case of Wagner,' (*b*) 'Nietzsche *contra* Wagner,' (*c*) 'Selected Aphorisms,' all translated by Anthony M. Ludovici, and (*d*) 'We Philologists,' translated by J. M. Kennedy. The Wagner parts have appeared already, but the volume as a whole is new (3s. 6d. net). (4) 'The Dawn of Day,' translated by J. M. Kennedy (5s. net). (5) 'The Twilight of the Idols,' 'The Antichrist,' 'Notes to Zarathustra,' and 'The Eternal Recurrence,' all translated by Anthony Ludovici (5s. net). (6) 'Ecce Homo,' translated by Mr. Ludovici, and the Poetry, which has been rendered into English by four different translators (6s. net). In the end of the last-named volume is reprinted Salome's 'Hymn to Life,' with the music to which it was set by Nietzsche.

Now this catalogue will be interesting to none but members of the Nietzsche cult. To all others it would have been enough to say that this edition

of Nietzsche, which is now so nearly complete, is an edition worthy of its Edinburgh publisher and its Edinburgh printers (for it is right to remark that the printing has been beautifully done by Messrs. Morrison & Gibb), and more than worthy of Nietzsche. But even if it is more than Nietzsche deserves, it was right that if the thing was to be done at all it should be done well. There are book-lovers who are fond of sets. *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche* make a set that the eye can rest on complacently.

ii. Psychology.

Take first an *Introduction to Psychology*, by Robert M. Yerkes, Assistant Professor of Comparative Psychology in Harvard (Bell; 6s. 6d. net). The word 'Introduction' is not used inconsiderately. 'This book is an outline of Psychology,' says the author, and then he proceeds to explain: 'There are two types of text-books of psychology: the outline and the manual. They differ in purpose and content. An outline is intended primarily to give students a general view of the subject-matter, aims, methods, values, and relations of the science. A manual serves rather to present the materials of the science as a definitely organized body of knowledge. The former is a sketch of the science: the latter is a compendium of facts. Unfortunately, both for them and the science, not a few students are introduced to psychology by a manual instead of by an outline. The experience is unfortunate, because only the exceptionally industrious or able student ever discovers what the subject really is and may mean. The manual so overwhelms the average beginner that he loses himself in a turmoil of facts, and remains unappreciative of the science, because he knows neither its aims nor its relations. It is just as important in psychology as in forestry that one should see the wood clearly and understand its general characteristics before undertaking to study its individual trees in detail.'

Professor Yerkes' book, therefore, is not a manual but an outline, and an outline is an introduction. Possibly the American edition is called an outline. For it is curious how one word is favoured in one country and another in another. We like 'introduction' here; they prefer 'outline' in America. And yet Clarke's *Outline of Theology* has had a great circulation in this country. In any case, this book is properly called an introduction, for it takes the student who has no previous knowledge of the study of psychology and gives him something more than a speaking acquaintance with it.

Every month gives us an American book on Psychology; this month has given us two. Besides Professor Yerkes' *Introduction* there is a volume by Dr. David A. Murray, late Principal of the Osaka Theological Training School, on *Christian Faith and the New Psychology* (Revell; 6s. net).

There is a little restiveness here and there over the application of undigested psychology to the facts of religious experience. And it cannot be denied that a sort of psychologist exists who, with a dissecting-knife in one hand and a batch of statistics in another, attempts to make religious experience an affection of the liver. But on the other hand it is just as undeniable that the use of psychology, a properly digested and discriminate use of it, in the theological domain has freshened theology itself and made for progress in the understanding of the facts of Christian experience.

Dr. Murray is perhaps a trifle enthusiastic over the new psychology, but at least he knows the subject. And besides that, he has himself had the experience which he endeavours by means of it to explain. Whatever faith he has in the virtue of the new psychology he is ever supremely loyal to the mercy of God in Christ.

If we want a book to deliver us from the eccentricities of a misapplied psychology, and a book that at the same time will prove to us that psychology has a real service to render to Christian life, we shall find that book in the Cunningham Lectures for 1911. The title is *The Psychology of the Christian Soul*. The author is the Rev. George Steven, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

Mr. Steven did a brave thing when he took this subject for his Cunningham Lectures. For he knew the distrust in men's minds, and he knew the intrinsic difficulty of it. Only a man of enthusiasm would have done it; only a man of spiritual as well as intellectual enthusiasm. But it is well for us all that a book on this subject should have appeared at this time from the well-informed and well-balanced mind of a Scotsman. Mr. Steven's scholarship will not be challenged. His judgment will not be denied. And yet the most attractive

thing about his book is the sympathy he has thrown into it, a sympathy which seems to pass directly from writer to reader. That the lecturer was in touch with his audience we can well understand. But it is not often that when the lecturer turns author he keeps his hold undiminished.

Mr. Steven is more interested in the fact of conversion than in the explanation of it, and he uses his knowledge so that the fact becomes more real as the explanation becomes more intelligible.

One more book yet on Psychology comes from America this month. But this time it is only the translator that is American. The author of the book is Dr. Theodore Flournoy, Professor of Psychology at the University of Geneva. Under the title of *Spiritism and Psychology*, Professor Flournoy's book has been translated, abridged, and introduced by Mr. Hereward Carrington (Harpers; 7s. 6d. net). It will be understood from the title, if it is not understood from the author's name, that this book deals with the subject of psychical research. We receive many books dealing with psychical research, but the translator tells us that a really good book on the subject appears only about once in a decade, and he further believes that this is such a book. We agree with him. Every unfettered reader will agree with him. It is true Professor Flournoy believes in spirit-rapping and the like as only a few of his readers will be able to believe; But he is really a careful scientific investigator, and he has spared no pains to reach accurate knowledge. Moreover, on an intricate subject like this it is always better to read a book by a man who believes than by a man who does not. Needless to say, it is a well-written book, but it is also well translated. And the publishers have added to the interest of it by inserting ten illustrations. There are portraits of Frederic Myers and Mrs. Piper and others.

In connexion with the use that is now made of psychology to explain the phenomena of religious experience, it is interesting to observe that one of the greatest authorities on the history of Religion is also the author of our standard text-book of experimental psychology. This is Charles S. Myers, M.A., M.D., Sc.D., University Lecturer in Experimental Psychology, Cambridge. A second edition of Dr. Myers' work on Experimental Psychology has been published at the Cambridge University Press in two volumes, the first volume being the text-book, while the second volume contains laboratory exercises. The title is *A Text-Book of Experimental Psychology, with Laboratory Exercises* (2 vols., 10s. 6d. net). If there is any risk of men dabbling in psychology theoretically and arriving thereby at foolish conclusions, the way to remove that risk is to take a course in Experimental Psychology under the guidance of Dr. Myers.

---

iii. Ethics.

Professor W. R. Sorley has written one of the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature.' It is a manual of *The Moral Life* (Cambridge Press; 1s. net). He says that his purpose in the little book is to give a popular account of the nature of goodness in human life. His chapters accordingly are, first, The Moral Life; next, Temperance, Courage, Wisdom, and some other personal virtues; then Justice and Benevolence. The last chapter deals with 'Religion and the Moral Life.' In that last chapter Professor Sorley offers a welcome defence of Christianity against the charge that it adopts a cringing attitude in the presence of God. He shows that cringing is as unchristian as it is profoundly immoral.

The new volume of Mr. J. Brierley's ever-readable and ever-suggestive essays, reprinted from *The Christian World*, is entitled *The Secret of Living* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Brierley discusses the things that have to be accomplished in life, both by us and in us, the services that have to be rendered, the virtues that have to be acquired. Two of the most original of the essays have the titles of 'Doing Without' and 'Doing With.'

Professor Hugh Black has written another book in popular ethics. This time the title is *Happiness* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net). It is a good subject for the president of a young men's guild or even the preacher of young men's sermons. And these very responsible and sometimes much distracted men will be glad to know how Professor Black divides his subject. He has nine chapters, making nine excellent addresses. Their titles are (1) The Right to Happiness, (2) The Duty of Happiness, (3) The Sources of Happiness, (4)

The Secret of Happiness, (5) The Art of Happiness, (6) The Grades of Happiness, (7) The Shadow of Happiness, (8) The Foes of Happiness, (9) The Heart of Happiness. But these chapters would be nothing if they had not an informing spirit. This sentence contains it: 'If we are living under a leaden sky, it is because our faith is not flowering out in the sunshine of God's love, radiant with the joy of possessing that love.'

My Neighbour's Landmark may not promise much as the title of a book (Melrose; 2s. net). Nor may the sub-title, 'Short Studies in Bible Land Laws,' promise more. But you will read a good deal in social Christianity without gaining as much instruction as this small book will give you. For the author, Mr. Frederick Verinder, has the root of the matter in him, and he writes very wisely. It will be a wonder to many a one to find how nearly the ancient Hebrew social situation corresponds with ours, and how well their laws and institutions fit us.

Canon Ball of Peterborough has published a series of short, simple addresses on *Character* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d.). He sees that character is commensurate with the use that is made of temptation. He believes that a judgment is waiting its misuse.

Have you come across Mr. Stanley M. Bligh's book on the 'Direction of Desire'? If you have you will send for his new book, *The Desire for Qualities* (Frowde; 2s. net). And you will not be disappointed with it. It needs study; some pages take a little time. But it is edifying. The title is not quite clearly accounted for, but it has its uses for the curious. Mr. Bligh is a moralist, not a theologian, and he does not often take the word 'sin' upon his lips, nor ever with any unction. And yet the man who calls sin a fall upward is the man who should read the book most carefully.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published a third edition of *Our Giving*, a plea for increased liberality on the part of God's people, by Mr. J. Forbes Moncrieff (1s. net).

Christ or Chaos, by Mrs. E. S. Watson [Deas Cromarty], is not ethics pure and simple, nor theology pure and simple, but that fine mixture of the two which every teacher must aim to impart, and every man and woman must strive to accept. Mrs. Watson believes in God, in Christ, in Man. Her faith has been unmoved by the superficialities of the modern magazine writer, though she has read them all. And her purpose in this book is to show that her faith rests on a good foundation. It is a cultured Christian woman's *Apologia* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net).

'Put into a nutshell, it is this way: our current Industry employs the least possible number of workers, at the least possible wage, for the longest possible work-day, at the hardest possible toil. This is a plain and brutal statement, but it is not exaggerated. It is the unpleasant truth. And not only is it the truth, but just so long as Industry is carried out for Profit, and not for human welfare, it is almost inevitable. In those industries which are not monopolies, the fault hardly lies with the individual masters. It is an inherent part of the competitive system. All is fair in love and war. And competition is war.'

These sentences enable us to see at once the purpose, the standpoint, and the style of a book by Mr. C. Hanford Henderson, of which the title is the single word *Pay-day* (Constable; 6s. net). Competition is war, and war is nothing but mischief and misery. Therefore competition must go. Mr. Henderson is not in the least disturbed with such ethical objections as the value of competition for the training of character. Competition is war, and war is simply evil. And those who have gone deeply into the questions of profit and loss agree with Mr. Henderson.

Let this list of the ethical books of the month end with a charming small volume of essays by the Rev. Frederic W. Macdonald, called *The Shining Hour* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. 6d. net). Certain words, as Moderation, or phrases such as 'I intend to realize my own individuality,' are the topics of the essays. And each word or sentence is studied always in independence, and sometimes in open rebellion.

THE BIBLE.

The book with which to begin a survey of the Biblical literature of the month is Dr. Warschauer's *What is the Bible?* (Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). It is itself a survey—a modern survey, he calls it—of the whole field. Now there are very few men

who are capable of writing a survey of the recent study of the Bible in all its parts. And perhaps there is no man who is more capable than Dr. Warschauer. It is true that he is called a liberal theologian; but if it is impossible—and perhaps it is impossible—for any man to express the exact shade of orthodoxy that is yours or mine, the right side for a man upon which to make a little deviation is the liberal side. Dr. Warschauer is sound on the fundamentals. He knows that there are certain things which cannot be denied without denying Christ. These things he affirms with unflinching faith, with a faith that has fought for them and is ready to fight again. And then Dr. Warschauer's knowledge is good, and that in every part of the Bible—quite surprisingly good for one man in these days of specializing.

A notable book is *The Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism*, by the Rev. J. Iverach Munro, M.A. Its purpose is given by Professor Orr in an introduction which he has contributed to it. Professor Orr says: 'The author of this volume selects for investigation what he esteems to be the important testimony to the antiquity of the Pentateuch furnished by the Samaritan recension of that work, seeking at the same time to vindicate that recension from aspersions cast upon it by Gesenius and others.' On the whole, it must be looked upon as an antidote to the Higher Criticism. But it is a mild antidote; for the author is a genuine scholar (Nisbet; 3s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Buchanan Blake, B.D., has been brave enough to publish a rhymed version of the *Book of Job*. Let us see how it goes. Here is the most familiar passage in all the Book.

> My God lives! Yea, this I know!
> As kinsman on my dust below,
> He'll stand as witness for me then,
> And lift His voice before all men.
>
> After my death, I God shall see
> Upon my very side to be,
> With mine own eyes, a stranger not,—
> My reins are whelmèd at the thought.

But this is not all, nor is it the most important part of the volume. About three-fourths of it is occupied with a discussion of the problem of suffering, which is spoken of as 'the problem of the Book of Job.' This problem, not as it presented itself to Job only, but also as it presents itself to ourselves to-day, is considered by Mr. Blake with insight and with ample scholarship. Professor Peake has already given us a valuable book on the problem of suffering in the Books of the Old Testament. There would scarcely have been room for Mr. Blake's had he confined himself to the same library. He is much fuller than Professor Peake on the Book of Job, but he is much shorter on the rest of the Books of the Old Testament. And then he turns to Greek tragedy and passes to modern literature. His last chapter is entitled 'The Problem of Suffering viewed from the Christian Standpoint.' The title of the book is *The Book of Job and the Problem of Suffering* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.).

It is an extraordinary thing that in extreme old age the late Mr. Joseph Bryant Rotherham was able to write a volume of *Studies in the Psalms* of more than 600 closely printed pages (Allenson; 10s. 6d. net). Mr. Rotherham has got himself a name by the issue of *The Emphasised Bible*. He has been able to use the translation of that Bible in the present work. In addition to the translation every Psalm has a full exposition, and there is besides an expository introduction containing four chapters. The first chapter is on the Psalms as literature, the second on the Psalms as lyrics, the third on the Psalms as a summary of sacred learning, and the fourth on the Psalms as a stimulus to holy living.

The Rev. W. R. Harvey-Jellie, M.A., B.D. Dr-ès-Let., has given us a new book on the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament. He has made it more than an historical investigation; he has made it good for the use of edifying. He considers what the Wisdom literature did for the Apostles, and he considers what it is able to do for us. And so he calls his book *The Wisdom of God and the Word of God* (Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). It is surprising that not more has been written on the Wisdom literature. There are commentaries in plenty on the books; but Mr. Harvey-Jellie's bibliography contains very few volumes that deal with the literature as a whole. Principal Skinner of Cambridge has long made a study of the

subject. His book, when it is published, will remove the reproach. But Mr. Harvey-Jellie may almost be said to have removed it already, for his book is good in every respect, well-balanced, sympathetic, clearly, and sometimes even eloquently, expressed.

When we come to the New Testament, the first book that demands notice is Professor Wendland's *Miracles and Christianity*, admirably translated into English by Professor H. R. Mackintosh (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). Not that Dr. Wendland deals exclusively with the miracles of the New Testament. It would be truer to say that he does not deal with them at all. But his book is the latest study of the miraculous, and without making up our minds about the miraculous we shall not go far into the New Testament.

It has been expected (we do not know how the expectation arose) that Dr. Wendland's book would be a great apologetic for orthodox Christianity. It is well to say that that is no part of the author's purpose, so that his readers may not be disappointed. He handles our Lord's miracles in a way that will scarcely satisfy any orthodox believer, however broad his orthodoxy may be. But while he rejects quite a number of the miracles, his book is really a strong argument on behalf of the miraculous. One wonders if those who throw overboard the miracles of the New Testament in the interests of Christianity have taken time to think what the consequences will be. Dr. Wendland shows very clearly that without miracle there can be no Christianity. Some will say, Very well, let Christianity and miracle go together. But Dr. Wendland shows quite as clearly that without miracle there can be no life. Are miracle and Christianity and life all to go?

Three critical essays on the Titles of our Lord, originally contributed by Professor B. W. Bacon to the *Harvard Theological Review*, have been reprinted and published along with a paper on the Christology of Peter. The title given to the volume containing them is *Jesus the Son of God, or Primitive Christology* (Frowde; 6s. net). The first essay is on 'Jesus the Son of God,' the second on 'Jesus as Son of Man,' and the third on 'Jesus as Lord.'

Mr. Robert Bird of Glasgow is best known—and he is well known—as the author of *Jesus the Carpenter of Nazareth*, though he has also written a book on Joseph, and another on St. Paul. He continues his series of Bible biographies by issuing a volume on *John the Companion of Jesus* (Nelson; 5s.). It is a more handsome book than the others outwardly. It is a small quarto, printed in beautiful type on good paper and plentifully illustrated, ten of the illustrations being in colour.

It has not perhaps the novelty of *Jesus the Carpenter of Nazareth*, the reproduction of the local atmosphere not being quite so fresh. Its appeal seems to be not to children, and not to trained students of the Bible, but to the multitude of the lovers of the Word of God. It is a multitude much larger than that to which Farrar appealed in his Life of Christ, which became so popular. This book also ought to become popular.

To the series entitled 'The Revised Version edited for the Use of Schools,' an edition has been added of *The Epistles to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, and to Titus*, all in one volume (Cambridge Press; 1s. 6d. net). The editor is the Rev. H. W. Fulford, M.A., whose work is most satisfactory, a marvel of close packing and clearness.

The Rev. H. L. Goudge, D.D., Canon of Ely and Principal of Ely Theological College, has published in one volume, under the title of *The Mind of St. Paul*, four lectures on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which he delivered at the Oxford Summer School for the Clergy in July. Dr. Goudge will be remembered as the editor of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, in the 'Westminster Commentaries.' This is not a commentary; it is such work as careful commenting lays the foundation for. But besides the scholarship there is the gift of lecturing, which is not quite the same as preaching, being less hortatory, perhaps, and more instructive (Arnold; 2s. 6d. net).

The New Life of St. Paul, by Clement Wise (Griffiths; 6s. net), is new indeed. Is it lawful to be quite so much at home as Mr. Wise is with the unexpressed purposes and disappointments of St. Paul? Is it possible for a man of ordinary intellectual standing to live on such very intimate terms with 'the greatest Prophet after our Lord'? But if you accept Mr. Wise's attitude you have a very pleasant time before you. Truly

there is nothing commonplace or conventional in all the book. We have come, for example, to the account of St. Peter's deliverance from prison and Herod's horrid death. 'At this juncture the writer of this book fell asleep and dreamed. He saw the world as it was in the ages before man had appeared. Africa and Australia were submerged: in greater part, Arabia, Russia, and Central Asia were scarcely above the waves. Points of Cumberland and the Malvern Hills were lonely rocks, and the Highlands of Scotland were Lowlands. The troubles of Erin had not arisen to dismay and confound Liberal legislators, and before Lloyd George was born there were spitfires at Criccieth and Snowdon.

'The Plesiosaurus, the Iguanodon, and other misshapen monsters roared and lashed in the brine, and the white foam upon rocky shores was dashed with the blood of brutal contests.

'Those beasts reared their horrid forms and at night seemed to carry away a portion of the stars when they swung their necks and legs. There also the Pterodactyl spread its wing, and, when rising, shut off constellations in the East, and by the other wing shut off other constellations in the West. It was an age of monsters, and the horror of it slowly passed away.

'By-and-bye came on a softer scene, and a race of apes believed itself at the pinnacle of perfected animal creation. Those apes believed themselves to be the aim of evolution, and no higher organisms were to dominate the planet. After them nothing could possibly supervene.

'I heard their chatter in the Amazonian forest. It was a glorious evening. The sun had put on a tiara of rubies and shot his crimson arrows through the close green copses—shooting them high and higher as he sank, until the last sprays of twig and leaf looked black at a smiling moon.

'Then arose the voice of the baboons: "So listen to the accents of wisdom. Guard your tails and never allow them to grow less."'

A magnificent and most important contribution to the textual criticism of the Gospels has been made by Mr. H. C. Hoskier. We say magnificent; for the two volumes in which it appears are printed in the most expensive manner, with the use of all kinds of type to help the student's eye, and they have been most handsomely published by Mr. Quaritch. The title is *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament* (Gospels).

The book is in two volumes (12s. net). The first volume contains what the author calls 'Remarks suggested by the Study of ℘ and the Allied Questions as regards the Gospels.' The second volume contains appendixes. Look at the second volume first. It contains three appendixes and some occasional notes. The first appendix is a collation of *h* in St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John. The second contains an introduction and collation of St. John and St. Matthew in the Book of Dimma. The third contains an introduction and collation of certain passages in the Book of Moling. All these appendixes and notes are intended to support the arguments advanced in the first volume.

Now the arguments in the first volume are directed to show that the Westcott and Hort text is an unreliable text, having been built up by adhesion to hard-and-fast rules which are fundamentally false. The discovery of its unreliability was made by Mr. Hoskier in the course of his study of the versions; or, to be more exact, in the course of the study of those versions which are found in the library of Mr. J. P. Morgan. Mr. J. P. Morgan's initials, it may be mentioned in passing, are the explanation of the symbol ℘ on the title-page.

THE CHURCH.

To begin at the beginning. We have a book on the Acts of the Apostles. But it is called, and properly, *The Acts of the Risen Lord* (Kelly; 2s. net). The author is the Rev. Frederick J. Briggs, who reads the Acts as a record not of wonderful but of quite natural events, as soon as you have recognized the fact of the Spirit of God. That presence is everything. The only question remaining, which Mr. Briggs does not discuss, though he never lets it out of his mind, is, Why was the Spirit of God given in such fulness to the earliest Christians, that they could do naturally deeds which the greater number of us now cannot believe were ever done?

A curious book by Mr. John W. Taylor, called *The Coming of the Saints*, has been published by Messrs. Methuen (5s. net). It is further described as 'Imaginations and Studies in Early Church History and Tradition.' The author in

his preface says: 'I take you half-way back—to the ages of faith, to the belief of a thousand years ago—as I try to tell the happenings of two thousand years ago, and re-imagine the remoter past in the light of the traditions of our forefathers.' So, while others are occupied in the critical study of the early Church to separate fact from fiction, Mr. Taylor deliberately accepts the mixture as it has come down to us. For the legend is to him as useful as the true history. It is not that he is uninterested in the truth. It is that to him the truth of the imagination is more than the truth of physical fact.

From the Cambridge University Press there comes a history of the Armenian Church from 1820 to 1860. The title is *The Armenian Awakening* (5s. net). Mr. Leon Arpee has written the history of that memorable experience in the long life of the Church in Armenia. He has written it dispassionately, though that must have been difficult to do. He has written it out of the fulness of his knowledge of Armenia, the literature of Armenia, and the literature about Armenia. And now at last we have an opportunity of understanding that Church of which we are so culpably ignorant. To the Protestants of this country the history has a peculiar interest. For the Awakening has many points of contact, not only with the events which gave the name Protestant its existence, but also with more recent evangelical experiences, and even with the problems of this very hour.

Mr. Piercy, who edits the 'Library of Historic Theology' for Mr. Robert Scott, made a hit when he secured a volume from Dr. Alfred Plummer. He has secured two volumes. For *The Churches in Britain before A.D. 1000* could not be compressed into a single volume. As yet the first only is issued (5s. net). It has all the satisfactoriness we associate with Dr. Plummer's work—the scholarship, the conscientiousness, the grace. For popular reading it will supersede all the rest. And it is so clear and so reliable that it could be set for examination.

The most substantial volume of the month in Church History is devoted to *The Marprelate Tracts, 1588, 1589* (Clarke & Co.; 12s. 6d. net). The tracts are edited with notes, historical and explanatory, by William Pierce, the author of the *Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts*. Mr. Pierce has been wise enough to make this subject his own. His name is now and ever will be associated with the Marprelate controversy. He has not neglected other history and other literature; for he would have been far from wise if he had dealt with his subject as an isolated phenomenon. He has read all round it. But the Marprelate Tracts themselves have been his heart-centre, and never did they receive such careful capable study. Whatever other literature on them we possess may now be cleared off the shelf.

The Thirlwall Dissertation for 1911 has been written by Mr. H. F. Russell Smith, B.A. Its topic is *The Theory of Religious Liberty in the Reigns of Charles II. and James II.* (Cambridge Press; 4s.).

Two books remain, dealing with the history of the Church of Christ in localities.

One is *The Evangel in Gowrie*, containing sketches of men and movements in the Carse by the Rev. Adam Philip, M.A., of the United Free Church, Longforgan (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 4s. 6d. net). To turn its pages is to let names that are familiar catch the eye continually—Melville, the Haldanes, M'Cheyne, Kinnaird. Of these men Mr. Philip has written, not for the insignificant purpose of repeating the anecdotes that have clung to them, but for the purpose of revealing their saintly character and the fruit it bore. Of the movements which he recalls, one of the most significant (though in some aspects insignificant enough) was that which produced the Bereans. 'The keenest criticism and appreciation of Barclay, the founder of the Bereans,' says Mr. Philip, 'is that of the late Rev. Dr. A. Miller in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. In some of Barclay's statements Dr. Miller finds a Ritschlian strain.'

The story of an Irish Church, *St. John's, Monkstown*, has been told by Ralph William Harden, B.A., sometime vicar there (Hodges; 3s. 6d. net).

THEOLOGY.

When the Rev. John Huntley Skrine was elected Bampton Lecturer for 1911, it was a surprise to

many to hear that his subject was to be *Creed and the Creeds* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net). He did not seem more agitated about the Creeds or about Subscription than any one else; and there were other matters, such as the practical life of the pastor among his people, which he seemed to be more concerned with. But he chose *Creed and the Creeds*, and soon showed that he had things to say on that subject that were worth listening to.

He is really not intensely interested in Subscription. What he is interested in is the relation between the life of the Spirit and the life of the world. And he chose his subject because he took the view that a creed is not a fetter on the understanding or even an instrument of torture, but an attempt to show how the boundary line travels between the things that are of God and the things that are of men. Here we are in the body. The world is with us. How shall we keep it from being too much with us? By a statement of what is meant by the Spirit and the things of the Spirit—by such a statement as shall guide, encourage, and inspire us to live in the world without being of the world.

Now, when such a statement, or series of statements, is made, we look upon it as an encouragement to the development of man and society, and their progress towards that goal of perfectness set before us in the Gospel. The proper creed therefore enlarges, and in enlarging unifies. And Mr. Skrine finds in the attitude to the creeds of the future the surest guarantee against further separation, the surest guide to oneness in Christ Jesus.

There is a feature of the last three Bampton Lectures, if not more, that is most important. Their authors have believed in their mission. The word has been as a fire in their bones.

What is the object of all religious ritual? What is the end of all religion? What did Christ Jesus come in the flesh to secure? The answer to all these questions is 'Communion with God.'

Communion with God—it is the only thing worth having. If any one has lived his life without obtaining it, he has missed the end of his being.

So this is the subject of a beautiful, reasonable, sympathetic book, of which the joint authors are the Rev. Darwell Stone, D.D., and the Rev. David Capell Simpson, M.A. Its title is simply *Communion with God* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net).

There are few matters in theology more important than the change that has come over the meaning of the word 'atonement.' Now it means the making of some sacrifice or satisfaction in order that God may be reconciled. Formerly it meant the reconciliation itself. Accordingly Professor George Coulson Workman has written a book, in which he has examined critically every passage in the Bible in which the idea of atonement, in any sense, occurs, in order that he may restore the word to its ancient meaning, or, if that is not possible, replace it everywhere by the word 'reconciliation.' For he is fully convinced that reconciliation is the Biblical idea everywhere. *On which see Driver.*

The title of the book is *At Onement or Reconciliation with God* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

Are we ready for a new Pearson? Shall we find him in the new book of the Rev. Harold Smith, M.A.? Mr. Smith makes no such demand. Yet it is so. We may read Pearson still. But in that volume which Mr. Smith has written, and which he has called *The Creeds, their History, Nature, and Use* (Robert Scott; 5s. net), we shall find nearly all that Pearson can give us, and in more modern language as well as addressed to a more modern and difficult religious life.

It is an exposition of the Creed as well as a history of Creeds. And it is scholarly. Thus there is no easy solution of the difficulty about the words for Atonement in the Bible. That the word usually means reconciliation is stated. But it is also stated that the Hebrew word is properly rendered 'propitiation.' And the advice is given not to press the derivation of the English word or its use in Ro 5^{11}, as that 'represents only one aspect of the doctrine.'

Mr. Robert Scott is the publisher also of a volume by the Right Rev. J. W. Diggle, D.D., Bishop of Carlisle, on *The Ministry of the Word and Sacraments* (2s. 6d. net); and of a study of the Nature and Significance of Christ's Redemptive Work, by the Rev. James Little, B.A., S.T.D., which is published under the title of *The Cross in Holy Scripture* (2s. net).

The Rev. J. J. Lias, M.A., Chancellor of Llandaff Cathedral, has done a brave thing. He detests the heresy of the Rev. Thomas Allin, D.D., on the Future State, but he loves his heresy on Augustinianism; so he has edited Dr. Allin's book on *The Augustinian Revolution in Theology* (Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net), and risked the harm the one heresy may do for the sake of the good which may be found in the other.

Dr. Allin and Mr. Lias will have nothing to do with Augustine. Dr. Allin 'attacks the foundations on which Augustine's fascination for mankind has so long rested,' and Mr. Lias blesses the attack. For in his old age Mr. Lias finds Augustine too crude and harsh, out-Calvining Calvin, and horribly sentencing to everlasting destruction from the presence of God those who never had a chance of pleasing God.

It is curious that at a time when Scotland has lost its interest in systematic theology (almost in theology of any kind), and is giving herself to the housing problem, England is keenly occupied with the old theological problems. Mr. Edward Arnold has published two theological books. One is called *The Church and Modern Problems* (3s. 6d. net). It is a vicar's ordinary parish preaching for the past two years. And it is good preaching. The author is the Rev. C. F. Garbett, M.A., Vicar of Portsea. The other volume is *The Faith of an Average Man* (3s. 6d. net), the average man being the Rev. C. H. S. Matthews, M.A., the author of *A Parson in the Australian Bush.*

Now Mr. Garbett has some interest in other things, but his chief interest is in Modernism and the New Theology. Mr. Matthews is entirely taken up with Sin, the Atonement, and Eternal Life. Both books are sincere and representative.

OTHER BOOKS.

With clocklike regularity volume after volume appears of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.* This is the eleventh, the next to the last (Funk & Wagnalls; 21s. net). Its greatest group of articles is found under the words 'Theological,' 'Theology.' That group runs from page 329 to page 401. There is an article on Theological Education, the principal part of which has been done by Dr. Ferdinand Cohrs. Of its two supplementary parts, one is written by Professor Rowe of Newton Theological Institution, the other being anonymous. The next article is on Theological Libraries, and it also is divided into three parts, Early and Medieval Libraries and German Libraries being described by Pastor Otto Radlach as in the original Hauck, while the libraries of the United States and Canada have a much longer article devoted to them, the seminaries being mentioned separately. But there is no reference to any libraries in any other part of the world. The next article is entitled 'Theological Science, American Contributions to.' Again, why only American? There follows a long article on Theological Seminaries. Every one of the theological seminaries in America is described by itself, and in almost every instance by a separate author; but once more the rest of the world is ignored. Then Kattenbusch's article in Hauck on Theology as a Science is translated and supplemented by an article, written by Professor Beckwith of Chicago Theological Seminary, on British and American Theology. In this article, therefore, we have some recognition of Britain, and the subject is dealt with in reasonable completeness. An article follows under the title of 'Theology, Moral, Roman Catholic View of.' This is an addition to the original German work. The article is written with good taste and sufficient knowledge by Dr. J. F. Driscoll of New Rochelle, New York. After 'Theology as a Science,' would it not have been better to have given the American Contributions to Theological Science here instead of having a separate article on the previous page?

These articles are not one-sided, they are simply incomplete. But their incompleteness is of some importance, though it must be of more importance to American readers than to others, because they can easily get access to information about their own seminaries and libraries. Nor is incompleteness characteristic of the whole volume, far less of the whole work. The word 'Theology' must have been found difficult to deal with in any case, and perhaps, as the work is drawing near its close, space is becoming more precious. It is always a mistake for the buyers of a book in many volumes to insist upon the number of its volumes being named exactly beforehand and rigidly adhered to.

It is not impossible, or even unlikely, that under the rule of Christian Britain the Christians of Egypt are the victims of distinct disabilities. For the Muhammadans have a superiority in numbers

that is overwhelming on the whole, and that prevails in every part, and all supreme governments must legislate and administer for the majority. In any case the Copts believe that they are treated unfairly. Accordingly, a book has been published which presents their case. It is admirable in tone and highly instructive. The editor is the distinguished Coptic Christian Kyriakos Mikhail, and there are contributions by Professor Sayce, Dr. A. J. Butler, Mrs. Butcher, and Mr. John Ward. The title is *Copts and Moslems under British Control* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 3s. 6d. net).

Here is another volume of Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier's most pleasing series on the Children of the World. This time it is *Children of Persia* (1s. 6d. net), by Mrs. Napier Malcolm. It is a wonderful book for the money, with its full-page illustrations in colour.

Her Highness the Maharani of Baroda, with the co-operation of Mr. S. M. Mitra, has written a book on *The Position of Women in Indian Life* (Longmans; 5s. net). She has been a traveller to Europe and America, and she is immensely impressed with the advantage to women of the freedom which they enjoy in the West. She is at any rate impressed with the intellectual advantage of it; she says little or nothing about its moral value. She has determined, therefore, to use all her influence for the purpose of encouraging India to adopt Western methods in the training and treatment of her women. The Maharani of Baroda is herself evidently no ordinary woman. This book owes its conception and its inspiration, its whole attitude and many of its most striking facts, to her. And it is noteworthy as a selection and criticism of Western civilization. The book is written for the use of native Indians, but it is worth the attention of those who are interested in the welfare of woman whether in Britain or America.

Here is another book by a woman and on the education of women. The author is Miss Margaret E. Burton, daughter of Professor Ernest D. Burton of the University of Chicago. Its subject is *The Education of Women in China* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). In her stay of six months in China in 1909, the one thing above all other things which arrested Miss Burton's attention was the progress made in the education of women. Among the changes that are taking place in China, and they are bewildering in their magnitude and rapidity, there is no change, she believes, so momentous as the change in life and outlook enjoyed by its women. In the face of the immensity of the ground that is yet to be covered, this is no doubt the day of small things. But a beginning of emancipation has undoubtedly been made, and it does not seem possible that even in China it can come to nought. Since her return home Miss Burton has studied the subject thoroughly, and the book which she has given us will not be forgotten when the history of this mighty movement comes to be written.

One of the results of the Second Missionary Conference on behalf of the Muhammadan world held at Lucknow in January 1911 is a handsome volume entitled *Islam and Missions* (Revell; 5s. net). It contains twenty of the papers read at the Conference.

Among the rest there is a paper by the Rev. W. H. T. Gairdner, B.A., Cairo, on 'Islam under Christian Rule.' And the striking thing in the paper is a vindication of the complaint made by the Copts in Egypt of unfair treatment under British rule. That complaint is made at length in a volume published this month and already noticed. Mr. Gairdner gladly refers to a change for the better which occurred just before Lord Cromer left Egypt. But still the Copts, who contribute their full share of the taxes out of which the Muslim teachers are paid, have further to pay their own Christian teachers, and Mr. Gairdner asks why the State should not pay both or none.

Mr. Walter Crane's papers and addresses on Art and Craft and the Commonweal, which he has published under the title of *William Morris to Whistler* (Bell; 6s. net), are quite out of the common and quite above the commonplace. The illustrations are surpassing fine, for they are mostly Walter Crane's own. But they are well matched by the words, which are his own also. A striking paper and memorable is that on 'The Socialist Ideal as a new Inspiration in Art.' We have lost faith in Art as a substitute for the Gospel of God, but we dare not lose faith in any effort that is put forth to bring a clean thing out of an unclean. Full of ethical insight also is the paper on 'Modern Aspects of Life and the Sense of Beauty.' There are things said there on Mammon which no preacher could say more bitingly.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

From the Interpreter's House to the House Beautiful.

This section of the book, although it is studded here and there with jewels, yet undoubtedly falls still farther below the level of the First Part than that which we have hitherto considered. The invention of the damsel Innocent for the opening of the door is happy enough to be impressive in spite of the polite rotundity of her little speeches. The conversation about themselves overheard by the pilgrims is true to life; for, when the spirit is deeply moved, everything that happens appears to have a providential reference to oneself.[1] The sentence, 'One smiled, and another smiled, and they all smiled,' is John Bunyan at his best, because at his simplest.

But the fault of the whole passage is that the sense of mystery is to a great extent lost. The Interpreter's House, the House of the Spirit, must ever be a mysterious place. In the First Part the mystery is sustained. The presence of the Interpreter is one of those withdrawn and reticent facts of experience, whose occultness convinces us by its truth to life. Here all that is gone, and instead of it we have familiarity, commonplace, and far too easy and prolific exposition.

At the same time, something may be said in justification of this broader treatment. To some, the fastidious reserve of the earlier description is its most exquisite and precious quality. But delicate spirituality is not the only fruit of the Spirit. There are those also whose coarser grain or rougher experience has made them unable to appreciate those finer shades of spiritual influence. Their more vulgar capacities require a teaching which they can understand. Perhaps John Bunyan is both wiser and finer than his critics after all, and has deliberately altered the tone of the Interpreter's House, as a protest that the Holy Spirit's gifts are not the monopoly of those who are in this sense spiritual.

The pilgrims are shown first the scenes which Christian saw—'the Significant Rooms,' as they are strikingly called. The only note that is new regarding them is the description of the minister's portrait as 'the picture of the biggest of all,' a phrase which confirms our former estimate of Bunyan's reverence for true religious guides.

Seven additional tableaux are presented, of which only two are valuable. 'The Butcher killing the Sheep' is one of the ugliest and most revolting things which Bunyan ever wrote. It is a vulgarized and coarsened version of Isaiah's perfect image (Is 53^{7}). Its last two sentences must have been written hurriedly. 'The King' has much more of Charles II. in him than of Him whose words were: 'The Good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.' The three pictures of 'The Hen,' 'The Spider,' and 'The Robin' are more ingenious than edifying. 'The Hen,' indeed, reappears later, enlisted for theological purposes in confirmation of Mr. Great-heart's sermon. The chicken which 'lifted up her head and her eyes towards heaven every time she drank,' is a much more valuable bird. 'The Spider' seems to have been one of John Bunyan's special aversions: he wrote a poem on this subject.[2] 'The Robin' is blamed, not for any cruelty to the spider it has captured, but for being so disgusting as to seek such food. 'The Field of Straw' is but a very much weaker version of the Parable of the Wheat and the Tares.

In 'The Garden' we enter a field of literature which has been very well wrought, both before and since John Bunyan's day. From Bacon's *Essay on Gardens*, and George Herbert's poems,[3] down to Thomas Edward Brown's 'A garden is a lovesome thing, God wot,' Alfred Austin's beautiful garden books and songs, and R. L. Stevenson's curious

[1] Cf. Robert Browning, *Epilogue to Dramatis Personæ*:—
'When you see what I tell you,—Nature dance
About each man of us, retire, advance,
As though the pageant's end were to enhance
His worth.'

[2] Cf. Bunyan's *Books for Boys and Girls*.

[3] 'I blesse thee, Lord, because I grow
Among thy trees, which in a row
To thee both fruit and order ow' (*Paradise*).

and self-revealing essay on the same theme, much has been delicately and ingeniously written on the subject. But it is questionable if in it all there is anything more perfect than these few words of Bunyan's. The simplicity of imagination and of diction, the childlike directness and beauty of vision, are here very perfect. And it is not too much to say of it, what Mr. A. C. Benson says of the Second Part in general, that there is not quite the same romance, perhaps, but there is more tenderness and sweetness.[1]

'The Man with the Muck-rake' is classical both in literature and in painting; and it is probably one of the creations of Bunyan's genius which will keep their hold on the imagination of the world so long as English books are read. Its criticism upon the materialism of mankind strikes home to-day as keenly as it did of old: for heaven is still 'but as a fable to some,' and 'things here are counted the only things substantial'; while the prayer, 'Give me not riches,' is still but a 'rusty' prayer.

Proverbs.

It is a pity that some spirit of selection and cutting down had not come upon the author, inducing him to send on such gems as these, and ruthlessly to leave out much else. Had he done this, it is safe to say that the Second Part of his *Pilgrim's Progress* would not only have surpassed the First, but would have been among the most exquisite of English writings. But his mind and imagination were profusely fertile. The allegorizing mood was on him, and sententious and proverbial remarks seem to crackle from him like electric sparks at a touch.

After the tableaux, there follows a series of thirteen of these little similes or proverbial notes. They are of various merit, but for the most part more or less trite. While still drawing from human nature, the work is conscious, and tends towards the artificiality which is the distinguishing mark of Chaucer's early romances in contrast with his *Canterbury Tales*. One almost suspects that these are 'the stuffing of his travel-scrip'—the contents of some Commonplace Book or collection of wayside notes for which he had not been able to find a relevant place in his main story. The same remark applies to the catechizings and questions which are immediately to follow. In the saying about women's dress he reverts to a subject which he has touched upon in the quaint poem 'On Apparel.' Since the days of Isaiah, men's remarks about women's clothing have been a curious and extensive byway of literature. It is characteristic of the times, when the Restoration had lowered all considerations connected with sex to a sensuous tone, that even religious writings tend so often to a regrettable materialism. The Second Part of the allegory, where we are in the company of noble women, has considerably more frequent references to sins of the flesh than in the former Part.

After the flesh comes the devil, in the final scene of the tree, fair with leaves externally, and yet rotten within, symbol of those professors whose heart is 'good for nothing but to be tinder for the devil's tinder-box.' Only two of the sentences may be said to have any special value. One is Bunyan's version of a sentiment found in many Puritan writers, 'If a man would live well, let him fetch his last day to him, and make it always his company-keeper.' The other is striking and full of the insight which we find so far-reaching in the Book of Proverbs, 'Whispering and change of thoughts prove that sin is in the world.'

Incidents of the Evening and Morning.

The evening closes with supper accompanied by music and a song, which translates, in sweet and simple verses, the beginning of the 23rd Psalm.[2]

[1] Cf. two exquisite passages from Bunyan's *Christian Behaviour*, quoted Brown, *John Bunyan*, chap. xi.

[2] The writer has received from a friend the following interesting note:—

'There appear to have been several versions of the metrical Psalms in use at one time or another, but none of them attained to much popularity saving those by Sternhold and Hopkins, and Tate and Brady, the latter being the compilers of the collection presently in use.

'The first verse of the 23rd Psalm quoted by Bunyan is taken from S. and H.'s collection, but he had evidently gone to some other source (possibly himself) for the last verse, afterwards sung, along with a verse of Psalm 100, in the House Beautiful. The probable explanation of this is that he had committed to memory more than one version of the psalm, and in quoting it he had not been careful to see that the two verses were taken from the same version.

'While Thomas Sternhold and John Hopkins were the chief contributors to the collection, there were three or four others who assisted, among them being William Kethe, who was an exile with Knox at Geneva. This man is memorable as the author of the only rendering now much used of the S. and H. collection, namely, "All people that on earth do dwell," and you will observe that the quotation by Bunyan

Christiana and Mercy tell the story of their setting out, but without any new features. The Interpreter speaks more than he did to Christian, but his speech is more conventional and tends to prosiness and excessive quotation of passages of Scripture which are not always remarkable for their relevancy. With the women his manner is caressing and fatherly, and he calls them 'sweetheart' or 'my darlings.' Supper ended, the night's rest follows, though Mercy has little sleep for joy of her assurance. In the morning there is the garden bath in the open air, after which they are sealed in the forehead and endued with robes of white linen. Great-heart is introduced as their conductor for the next stage—a Puritan divine and soldier, who fitly represents the Church Militant in its defending power. As they set out, Christiana sings, but her song is no improvement on Christian's poorest efforts.

of the last verse of the 100th Psalm is in exactly the same form as we use it to-day.

'S. and H.'s version appeared in 1562, and for more than two centuries it was the only or chief metrical provision of the Church of England. Since 1700 or so it has been called the "Old Version" to distinguish it from Tate and Brady's collection.

'Of the S. and H. version Fuller said that its authors' "piety was better than their poetry, and they had drunk more of Jordan than of Helicon"; and Campbell observed "that they with the best intentions and the worst taste degraded the spirit of Hebrew psalmody by flat and homely phraseology, and, mistaking vulgarity for simplicity, turned into bathos what they found sublime." But Keble and others have valued their work for its fidelity to the original, and their version continued to be used in many places far into the nineteenth century.'

Cf. also Milton's and George Herbert's versions of Psalm 23.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM CXXVI. 6.

'Though he goeth on his way weeping, bearing forth the seed;
He shall come again with joy, bringing his sheaves with him.'

THIS Psalm should be read in conjunction with Ps 137. The two Psalms are as pendant pictures; they show us the beginning and the end of Israel's bondage in Babylon, and suggest to us the history of their intervening life. The Babylonian captivity fell upon the Jews with paralyzing force. They could but 'sit down and weep by the rivers of Babylon'; 'hanging their harps upon the willows,' and with their hands fallen listless by their side, they remembered Zion, and wept. But while they wept they toiled; they sowed, and strangers gathered in the fruit. At length their own harvest came; God turned their captivity as He sent the rain-streams upon the barren south lands. He had watched their patient toil, their sorrowful fidelity; and after many years He gave them their reward. Deliverance came to them from the ruler of Babylon himself; they returned to their own land with the good wishes and the sympathies of their taskmasters. Then were they 'like them that dream'; they could scarcely believe the unexpected blessing that had befallen them. 'Their mouth was filled with laughter, and their tongue with singing.' Their heathen captors shared their gladness; they, too, rejoiced that Jehovah had visited His people, saying, 'The Lord hath done great things for them.' The Lord hath done great things for us, responded the joyous freedmen, 'The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad.' They had gone, they had gone, weeping, bearing their seed basket; they came, they came, rejoicing, bringing their sheaves with them.

A few years ago, a severe drought occurred in South Africa. For many months the sun blazed from a cloudless sky and scorched every blade of grass. The time for sowing came, and every passing cloud was eagerly scanned in hope of rain, but not a drop fell. Clouds appeared at intervals that gave much promise, but the withering north wind sprang up and scattered them. Consternation could be seen on many faces when the time for sowing was over: for it meant a year of gnawing hunger for their families.

On one of my many rides in the Somerville Mission district, I passed a man one day trying to cultivate a patch of land with a hoe. In conversation he told me he was sowing the last grains of maize he had, and that his hungry children had been crying for them that morning.

The year following the drought a plentiful rain fell, and gave the people a record harvest. Truly that sower sowed in tears, but reaped in joy. He went on his way weeping, bearing forth the seed; and came again with joy, bringing his sheaves with him.[1]

I.

Sowing has to be with weeping.

1. All men are in a sense sowers. Every thought harboured in the brain is the seed-corn of action, and every act the germ of habit. Each man is daily sowing the seeds of his own character and destiny. And if we view men less as individuals than as members of society, we know well that as long as the subtle and mysterious force which we call influence flows out from us, every word of a man's lips and every act of his life which others may hear and see, are as seeds dropped into the social soil.

But the disciple of Christ is a sower in a deeper sense than this. To him has been entrusted by his Master the 'precious seed' of the Kingdom, and he goes forth from day to day to sow, not by accident or involuntarily, but with a set and deliberate purpose in life, the seeds which will bear a golden harvest in eternity. Filled with the Spirit of Christ, he sows the seeds of love in a world torn with bitter animosities and deadly hate. Seeds of kindness, seeds of sympathy, seeds of gentleness—these are the grain he scatters in the furrows of life.

Nor are these the only seeds the Master has entrusted to His followers. They possess the truth; they know its power; they love it, and love to scatter it in the great field of humanity. And 'precious seed,' too, is the truth they sow; precious because it is to hungry souls what bread is to their bodies—the staff of life; precious because it tells of a priceless Saviour; precious because it brings home to men the inestimable benefits of His Cross and Passion; precious because it clothes their barren lives with holy fruitfulness; precious because it opens before their eyes the gates of glory, and enables them to see their destiny of joy in the presence of the King.

An old woman in Glasgow was seen by a policeman picking up something from time to time in the street and dropping what she found into her apron. The policeman's curiosity was aroused, and he asked her to show him what her apron contained. She hesitated a moment, and then exposed an apronful of broken bits of glass. 'What do you want with those things?' he asked, thinking she was a little crazy. 'I'm only taking them out of the way of the bairnies' feet,' she answered.[2]

2. But, while each of us is a sower, that is not the particular thought of this verse. The principle lying in the text is this, that as long as the sowing time lasts, be it ever so short or ever so long, the sower is a mourner. How near that conception comes to our Saviour's benediction, 'Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.' The Christian conception of this mourning, however, goes deeper than that of the Old Testament; yet even for the Psalmist this principle contained two important elements. One was this: He saw that wherever there was a true man, or a true nation in the world, it would have to overcome the determined opposition of the world forces. The world could not understand the secret of its life, but would seek to crush it out with violence and scorn, and drive it into the desert places of solitude and grief. The other element that entered into the ancient idea was, that so long as the Kingdom of God was delayed and the harvest of Zion's glory did not come, the low estate of the Messianic Kingdom would be a constant source of poignant grief to the earnest soul.

The true man to-day is in some sense like 'the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,' and the burden of the world's sin and the world's sorrows rests upon his heart. The Cross of Christ has made sin exceedingly sinful, so that the sin in our own hearts and in the world has become a burden of sorrow. No less has the Cross revealed the worth of the human spirit, and made the Christian life quiver in sympathy with the woes of a fallen world. So the sower of good seed, from the Son of Man to His humblest follower, may be described in the words of this passage, 'He goeth on his way weeping, bearing forth the seed.'

When I consider Life and its few years—
A wisp of fog betwixt us and the sun;
A call to battle, and the battle done
Ere the last echo dies within our ears;
A rose choked in the grass; an hour of fears;
The gusts that past a darkening shore do beat;
The burst of music down an unlistening street—
I wonder at the idleness of tears.
Ye old, old dead, and ye of yesternight,
Chieftains and bards, and keepers of the sheep,
By every cup of sorrow that you had,
Loose me from tears, and make me see aright
How each hath back what once he stayed to weep;
Homer his sight, David his little lad![3]

[1] Dundas L. Erskine.

[2] G. A. Sowter, *Sowing and Reaping*, 4.

[3] Lizette Wordsworth Reese, in *Scribner's Magazine*.

(1) 'They that sow in tears. . . . He goeth on his way weeping'—these are not the few who have been haunted by apparent failure, or beset with outwardly painful conditions of service. They are not those who have walked in the shadow of a lost leader, or toiled in the grey loneliness of a lost comrade or of a brother proved untrue. For apparent failure, outward difficulty and loneliness, often as we may have to face them, are, after all, only the accidents of Godward toil. And if the bearer of seed for God's great harvest should go forth to find no experience of these things, still, if he is to do any real work in the fields of the Lord, he must go forth weeping. He must sow in tears.

(2) The tears that are the pledge of harvest are not called to the eyes by ridicule or opposition. They are not the tears of disappointment, vexation, or impotence. They are tears that dim the eyes of them that see visions, and gather in the heart of them that dream dreams. To see the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, and the blindness of the world's heart to that glory; to see unveiled the beauty that should be, and, unveiled too, the shame that is; to have a spiritual nature that thrills at the touch of the perfect love and life, and responds to every note of pain borne in upon it from the murmurous trouble of the world,—this is to have inward fitness for the high work of the Kingdom.

'I have suffered too, my dear . . . but I knew you would come back. . . . And to-day, Henry, in the anthem, when they sang it, "When the Lord turned the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream," I thought, yes, like them that dream—them that dream. And then it went, "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy; and he that goeth forth and weepeth, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him"; I looked up from the book, and saw you. I was not surprised when I saw you. I knew you would come, my dear, and saw the golden sunshine round your head. . . . Now—now you are come again, bringing your sheaves with you, my dear.' She burst into a wild flood of weeping as she spoke; she laughed and sobbed on the young man's heart, crying out wildly, 'Bringing your sheaves with you—your sheaves with you!'[1]

3. *It is his tears that cause him to go forth.* It is his sorrow that will not let him rest. True pity is a mighty motive. When the real abiding pathos of life has gripped a man's heart, you will find him afield doing the work of the Lord.

If there had not been the sowing in Gethsemane, and on Calvary, the after-joy could never have been a hope in Christ's heart. Into the kingdom of His joy He, too, passes through tribulation. He went forth weeping—a man of sorrows—smitten, afflicted: He went forth carrying His precious burden—the seed of the world's life, His life, and death, and resurrection—His truth, and love, and holiness. He went forth offering Himself as seed. For He was Himself the seed out of which redemption was to spring for men. And for this seed, as for the seed of the commonest herb that grows, He recognized and honoured the law, 'Except a corn of wheat die, it abideth alone.' He went forth on His sublime enterprise—the work of redemption—sowing the world's heart with the blood of His own.

4. No man ever wept like this and went not forth, but some go forth who have not wept. And they go forth to certain failure. They mishandle life, and with good intent do harm. But that is not the worst thing to be said about these toilers without tears. It is not that they touch life so unskilfully, but they touch so little of it. It is only through his tears that a man sees what his work is and where it lies. Tearless eyes are purblind. We have yet much to learn about the real needs of the world. So many try very earnestly to deal with situations they have never yet really seen. For the uplifting of men, and for the great social task of this our day, we need ideas, and enthusiasm, and all sorts of resource; but most of all, and first of all, we need vision. And the man who goes farthest, and sees most, and does most, is 'he that goeth forth and weepeth.'

The captivity had done great things for the Jews, and had brought them within measurable distance of achievements of spiritual splendour. Every one is agreed that during the captivity the Jews grew in spiritual conception and force and power as they had never grown in their history previously. When their external prosperity was taken away from them, when the hostile world closed around them, their inner life began to flourish and grow like Lebanon. Read the wonderful post-exilic prophecies in the second part of the Book of Isaiah; read the wonderful post-exilic Psalms, and you will see that they reveal a marvellous spiritual development, that they bear testimony to an unparalleled ascent of the people to a nobler standpoint, and if they did not rise later to the height of their new possibilities, yet out of them came the Christ, the Saviour of the world; and from their midst sprang the first apostles, who turned the world upside down. Ancient and modern experience agree that the inner life of man is often developed and spiritualized by adversity.[2]

[1] Thackeray, *Esmond*, Bk. II. chap. vi.

[2] J. Thomas.

II.

Reaping is to be with rejoicing.

1. They that sow in tears—in tears, vexed, disappointed, saddened, doubtful, wearying — shall reap in joy, shall doubtless come again with joy, and bring their sheaves home. God will not forget, forsake His heritage; He will bring all to pass; there will be fulfilment.

What does the Psalm say? He who wrote it is a Jew who has come back to Palestine with that colony of faithful men, who after the edict of Cyrus reoccupied the old home and rebuilt its walls and roofs and temple. Something has brought to his mind that day of wonder, the return of Israel from exile. A day of wonder indeed. An impossible bliss had fallen on them, too blessed, too marvellous for heart to credit: their astonished eyes swam as in a blessed dream: laughter ran from their joy-shaken hearts, song from their raptured lips: like voices in a dream came to them the speech of heathen neighbours watching them in their glad delirium: 'The Lord of this captive folk has done great things for them.' 'Yea, indeed,' cries the Psalmist, looking back from his quiet hour of sober certainty upon that far-back hour of miracle, 'indeed, the Lord has done great things for us: glad are we.' But there the strain changes softly from a wild joy to a wistful, 'Turn our captivity, O Lord, as the rivers in the south. Turn again our captivity. Bring back the many, many of Israel who still abide in the far heathen lands; bring them back to swell the ranks of these few, all too few, of Israel, scattered sparingly in the vacant land, half-lost among the vales and hill-tops, where once they dwelt a mighty people. Bring back, bring back our sons and daughters; let the stream of life flow again with broad current in its ancient stream-bed; fill up again our wasted, empty land, O Lord, and all-fulfil the promise Thou hast fulfilled but half.' Then pensively he closes, 'So it will be: it will be so. There is fulfilment for men's hopes, spite of doubt and sorrow. He that to-day goes casting seed with tears of disappointment at the barrenness of an unkindly soil, will doubtless come again some day in joy, and with the sheaves of his harvest in his bosom.' So spoke this old singer of Israel concerning the hopes of men and the fulfilment of hopes; so he spoke his thanksgiving for the years past, his faith for the years to be.

Always in my own ears has rung a saying of one of our wisest, who, speaking of some such things as are now in our minds, said to me, 'We know not what fulfilment is.' Aye, we do not know. And therefore perhaps our lives are fulfilled when most we think they have missed fulfilment. God does know what fulfilment is. He knows what our powers were meant for, what the use is upon earth of each of us, something probably very different from what our self-conceit, or else our self-distrust, pictured as the proper use of our particular life. Well, to that use we may have been put, although our own dreams of usefulness are left so unfulfilled. We come again from life's harvesting with a very sober, unexultant joy; but perhaps we are wrong in this want of joy; perhaps the sheaves are there, only in God's bosom, not ours.[1]

(1) No hour's fight was ever worth fighting if it was fought for the sake of the hour. The moments are ever challenging the eternal, the swift and busy hours fling their gauntlets at the feet of the ageless things. The real battle of life is never between yesterday and to-day; it is always between to-day and Forever. To isolate an experience is to misinterpret it. We may even completely classify experiences and yet completely misunderstand experience. To understand life at all we must get beyond the incidental and the alternating. Life is not a series of events charged with elements of contrast, contradiction, or surprise. It is a deep, coherent, and unfaltering process. And one feels that it was something more than the chance of the moment that led the singer of old to weave the tears and the rejoicings of men's lives into a figure of speech that stands for unity of process, even the figure of the harvest.

(2) The sweep of golden grain is not some arbitrary compensation for the life of the seed cast so lavishly into the ground, and biding the test of darkness and cold. It is the very seed itself fulfilled of all its being. Even so it is with the sorrows of these hearts of ours and the joy unto which God bringeth us. He does not fling us a few glad hours to atone for the hours wherein we have suffered adversity. There is a deep sense in which the joys of life are its ripened sorrows.

In the early part of Mr. Moody's evangelistic work he was stopping once in a home in the West, and saw there a bright boy about thirteen years old. He did not bear the name of the family he was living with, and yet he was treated like one of the family. Mr. Moody asked the lady of the house who he was, and she said, 'He is the son of a missionary; his parents couldn't educate their children in

[1] J. H. Skrine.

India, so they came back here. But they had learned the language of India, and they did not feel that it was right for them to stay. Finally the husband said, "You stay here and educate the children, and I will go back." The mother said, "No, God has used me there with you, and we will go together." "But," the father said, "you can't give up those children. You have never been separated from them since they were born. You can't leave them in this country." She said, "I can do it for Christ, if He wants me to." They made it a matter of prayer, and put a notice in the papers that they were going to leave their children, asking Christian people to take and educate them.'

This lady saw the notice and wrote that she would take one child and bring it up for Christ's sake. She said in telling about it: 'His mother came and stayed a week, and observed everything. She watched the order and discipline in my family, and after she was convinced that it was a safe place to leave her boy in, she fixed the day of departure. My room was adjoining hers, and when the time came to start I heard her pray, "Lord Jesus, help me now. I need Thee. Help me to give up this dear boy without a tear, that I may leave him with a smile. The last time he sees me I don't want him to see a tear in my eye. O God, help me, and give me strength." Then, she said, that mother came down and took her boy to her bosom, hugged him and kissed him with a smile on her face—not a tear—and left.

Some years after, Mr. Moody was preaching in Hartford, and found a young man who was in the habit of picking up the rough boys of the streets and bringing them to his meetings. He would sit with them around him, and, after the sermon, with great tenderness and skill, he would lead them to Christ. It pleased Mr. Moody very much, and he asked who he was. They told him his name, and said that he was in the theological seminary. He found that he was one of those five sons, and all of them were devout Christians, and were preparing themselves to return to India to take up the work that their father and mother had left.[1]

[1] L. A. Banks.

Our field is the world; whether sowing or reaping,
Or gleaning the handfuls that others have passed,
Or waiting the growth of the seed that with weeping
On rocky and desolate plains we have cast;
Yet each for his toiling and each for his mourning,
Shall one day rejoice when the harvest is done;
And know in the flush of Eternity's dawning
That the toil, the reward, and the glory are one.

2. It may be that we do not see a man's tears. There will be a smile in his eyes and, maybe, a song on his lips. For the sorrow and the joy of service dwell side by side in a man's life. Indeed, they often seem to him but one thing. It were a mistake to refer the whole meaning of the words about a man's coming 'again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him,' to some far day when the reapers of God shall gather the last great harvest of the world. Through his tears the sower sees the harvest. Through all his life there rings many a sweet prophetic echo of the harvest home:

Went ye not forth with prayer?
Then ye went not forth in vain;
'The Sower, the Son of Man,' was there,
And His was that precious grain.

Ye may not see the bud,
The first sweet signs of Spring,
The first slow drops of the quickening shower
On the dry hard ground that ring.

But the harvest-home ye'll keep,
The summer of life ye'll share;
When they that sow, and they that reap,
Rejoice together *there*.

Illustrations of Spiritual Truths from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall.'

By the Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E., Perth.

(*Continued from vol.* xxii. *p.* 461.)

Vol. ii. p. 127. 'In a small town of Phrygia . . . the magistrates and the body of the people had embraced the Christian faith: and as some resistance might be apprehended to the execution of the edict [of Diocletian], the governor of the province was supported by a numerous detachment of legionaries. On their approval the citizens threw themselves into the church, with the resolution either of defending by arms that sacred edifice or of perishing in its ruins. They indignantly rejected the notice and permission which was given them to retire, till the soldiers, provoked by their obstinate refusal, set fire to the building on all sides, and consumed, by this extraordinary kind of martyrdom, a

great number of Phrygians, with their wives and children.'

'Others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection' (He 11^{35}); 'Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul' (Mt 10^{28}). 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life' (Rev 2^{10}).

Vol. ii. p. 144. 'The entrance [to the Golden Horn] is about 500 yards broad, and a strong chain could be occasionally drawn across it, to guard the port and city from the attack of an hostile navy.'

'But there the Lord will be with us in majesty, a place of broad rivers and streams; wherein shall go no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby. For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us' (Is $33^{21.22}$). Great is the security of those who are thus protected by God.

Vol. ii. p. 148. 'On foot, with a lance in his hand, the emperor [Constantine] himself led the solemn procession; and directed the line which was traced as the boundary of the destined capital; till the growing circumference was observed with astonishment by the assistants, who, at length, ventured to observe that he had already exceeded the most ample measure of a great city. "I shall still advance," replied Constantine, "till He, the invisible guide who marches before me, thinks proper to stop."'

Surely a magnificent motto for the Foreign Mission enterprise! The Church of Christ cannot cease from advancing onwards and outwards, even into strange and unexplored lands, until the invisible Holy Spirit bids her halt!

Vol. ii. p. 155 *n.* 'If we could credit Codinus, Constantine built houses for the senators on the exact model of the Roman palaces, and gratified them, as well as himself, with the pleasure of an agreeable surprise.'

What may be only a legend in the case of these Italian senators, that in loyalty to their emperor they quitted their ancestral Roman homes, and found that they had not lost anything after all, is gloriously true in the case of those who quit the possessions of this passing world in answer to the claims of Christ. 'Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive a hundredfold *now in this time*, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life' (Mk $10^{29.30}$).

Vol. ii. p. 157. 'As Constantine urged the progress of the work with the impatience of a lover, the walls, the porticoes, and the principal edifices were completed in a few years, or, according to another account, in a few months: but this extraordinary diligence should excite the less admiration, since many of the buildings were finished in so hasty and imperfect a manner, that, under the succeeding reign, they were preserved with difficulty from impending ruin.'

Are not all works designed to be permanent necessarily constructed slowly? God has been building His city with significant deliberation. The foundations were laid in unknown antiquity, the copestone is not yet put in position. It took Christ not 'a few months,' but thirty-three years to found His Church, and the slowness of the process has been justified. The work has stood the test of time. Hasty sporadic missionary effort has left few permanent memorials in the countries attempted to be evangelized at breakneck speed. The great, successful, solid churches in the mission field, with their tens of thousands of converts, have been the result of many years of steady, laborious, persistent, and often seemingly fruitless, toil.

Vol. ii. p. 177. 'The soldiers insensibly forgot the virtues of their profession, and contracted only the vices of civil life. They were either degraded by the industry of mechanic trades, or enervated by the luxury of baths and theatres. They soon became careless of their martial exercises, and, curious in their diet and apparel, they loved downy bed and houses of marble, and their cups were heavier than their swords.'

A picture which is only too sadly true of many 'soldiers of Christ'! They forget that their very *raison d'être* is to fight against sin; they are found in places of amusement where vice is the subject of laughter; they give

over their 'martial exercises' of prayer and soul-discipline; they adopt all the world, love of ostentation, and pleasure, and ease, and riotous excess. 'Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong' (1 Co 16^{13}). 'Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier' (2 Ti $2^{3.4}$).

Vol. ii. pp. 193, 194. 'The remainder of the taxes . . . was furnished in a manner still more direct, and still more oppressive. According to the different nature of lands, their real produce, in the various articles of wine or oil, corn or barley, wood or iron, was transported by the labour or at the expense of the provincials to the Imperial magazines . . . for the use of the court, of the army, and of the two capitals, Rome and Constantinople . . . the agriculture of the Roman provinces was insensibly ruined, and in the progress of desoptism . . . the emperors were obliged to derive some merit from the . . . remission of tributes which their subjects were utterly incapable of paying . . . within sixty years after the death of Constantine . . . an exemption was granted in favour of 330,000 English acres of desert and uncultivated land, which amounted to one-eighth of the whole surface of the [fertile and happy] province [of Campania]. As the footsteps of the Barbarians had not yet been seen in Italy, the cause of this amazing desolation . . . can be ascribed only to the administration of the Roman emperors.'

'And Samuel said, This will be the manner of the King that shall reign over you . . . he will take your fields and your vineyards, and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants; and he will take the tenth part of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers and to his servants . . . and ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you' (1 S 8^{11-18}).

Vol. ii. p. 199. 'It was an ancient custom that the cities of Italy, who admired the virtues of their victorious general, adorned the pomp of his triumph by their voluntary gifts of crowns of gold, which, after the ceremony, were consecrated in the temple of Jupiter, to remain a lasting monument of his glory to future ages. . . . The triumph of Cæsar was enriched with 2822 massy crowns, whose weight amounted to 20,414 pounds of gold.'

Similarly, 'the four and twenty elders fell down before him that sat on the throne, and worshipped him that liveth for ever and ever, and cast their crowns of gold before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power' (Rev 4^{10}).

'Upon his [Christ's] head are many diadems' (Rev 19^{12}).

Vol. ii. p. 248. 'A temper naturally morose and violent, instead of being corrected, was soured, by solitude and adversity: the remembrance of what he [Gallus] had endured disposed him to retaliation rather than to sympathy: and the ungoverned sallies of his rage were often fatal to those who approached his person or were subject to his power. The cruelty of Gallus was displayed in the undissembled violence of popular or military executions (p. 249). . . . every apartment of the palace was adorned with the instruments of death and torture. . . . By his commands they rudely seized the præfect and the quæstor [of Antioch], and, tying their legs together with ropes, they dragged them through the streets of the city, inflicted a thousand insults and a thousand wounds on these unhappy victims, and at last precipitated their mangled and lifeless bodies into the stream of the Orontes (p. 251).' After a description of the long-drawn-out punishment of Gallus, Gibbon says: 'The sentence of death was signed, dispatched, and executed: and the nephew of Constantine, with his hands tied behind his back, was beheaded in prison like the vilest malefactor' (p. 253).

'With what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again' (Mt 7^{2}).

'Vengeance is mine, and recompence, at the time when their foot shall slide: for the day of their calamity is at hand. And the things that are to come upon them shall make haste' (Dt 32^{35}).

Vol. ii. p. 280. 'Julian attacked a body of 600 Franks who had thrown themselves into two castles on the Meuse. In the midst of that severe season, they sustained, with inflexible constancy, a siege of fifty-four days, till at

length exhausted by hunger [they surrendered]. The Cæsar immediately sent his captives to the court of Constantine, who, accepting them as a valuable present, rejoiced in the opportunity of adding so many heroes to the choicest troops of his domestic guards.'

It is only when, it may be after long resistance, we throw down our arms of rebellion and submit to Christ's rule, that we come to know the splendour of our new Master's service. He receives us into personal friendship, gives us an honourable place at His side, and permits us to take up arms now in *His* service. Some of those who have been stoutest in resisting Christ (*e.g.* St. Paul) have been afterwards among the 'choicest troops' in their Captain's warfare with the world's sin.

(*To be continued.*)

In the Study.

New Sermons.

THE beginning of a new publishing season always brings a bundle of new sermons. And the lover of books is glad. For there is no better literature than a good volume of sermons, though it may be admitted that there is no worse literature than a bad.

Perhaps the first place should be given to two new volumes of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series. The one is by Dr. H. G. Woods, Master of the Temple, Hon. Fellow and sometime President of Trinity College, Oxford. Its title is simply *At the Temple Church* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net). The other is called *A Disciple's Religion.* Its author is Canon W. H. Hutton, Fellow, Precentor, and formerly Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net).

They are both by Oxford men, and they have both the Oxford atmosphere. But their authors are preachers. With the careful choice of words there goes forth spiritual power.

The Rev. S. A. Tipple has published another volume, and called it *Days of Old* (James Clarke & Co.; 3s. 6d. net). He tells us that he did not want to publish it, for it does not contain his best sermons. He was not able to decipher his manuscript notes of the best, and so he consented under pressure to publish a few that happened to have been taken down in shorthand. It is a frank foreword, but the book will survive it. We only wish Mr. Tipple could decipher his notes, if he has many sermons that are better than these.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have also published a cheap edition of Dr. Matheson's *Thoughts for Life's Journey* (2s. 6d. net).

The Rev. A. L. Lilley of St. Mary's, Paddington Green, is a preacher and an Englishman. That he is a preacher crowds of listeners and multitudes of readers bear witness. But he is a preacher to the nation rather than to the individual, and the nation to which he preaches is emphatically an English nation. His new book is entitled *The Nation in Judgment* (Griffiths; 2s. 6d. net). One idea is prominent throughout—that God makes a nation fear in order that He may teach it to rejoice. This, says Mr. Lilley, was the distinction of Israel among all peoples. The day of the Lord was a day of rebuke and of fear, but it was also a day of hope and of joyful fulfilment. 'Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad . . . *for he cometh to judge the earth.*'

So far as the season has gone, the most important volume of sermon literature is the second volume of *The Expositor's Dictionary of Texts.* It does not differ in any respect from the first volume, which we reviewed at some length, except that it contains an index of topics touched in the outlines, and an index of outlines for the Church year. There is the same surpassing skill in the condensing of the sermons, and there is the same surprising accuracy in the references. There is very little poetry in the volume. The illustrations, which are taken from a wide range of reading, are almost all in prose. And that is wise, if the book is prepared for the average preacher. For it takes a preacher of more than average ability to quote even a single verse of poetry effectively. But the editors are not without ambition. A supplementary volume is promised for October 1912 which will contain poetical quotations only. The publishers are Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (25s. net).

Mr. T. H. Darlow has removed the texts of his sermons, for which we desire to chastise him. We hope we are not mistaken in calling them sermons. Right in the middle of the book there is a sermon of which the text must have been, 'For their sakes I sanctify myself.' It is Mr. Darlow at his best. And Mr. Darlow at his best is both mystical and practical. Here are two sentences: 'Many years ago, at a Gaelic communion service in the island of Iona, a venerable minister let fall a sentence which some of his hearers never forgot. "The Church," he said, "is the Lord's Supper to the world." In their own lives and characters the whole fellowship of the faithful must show forth the Lord's death and make it real before the eyes of men.'

The title of the book is *Via Sacra* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.).

A whole volume of sermons on the first three chapters of Genesis, and the preacher a doctor of medicine! The title is *The Creation Story in the Light of To-Day* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.); for this medical man is not a theologian in disguise, but a scientific worker much exercised over the reconciliation of science and Genesis. And yet he is more exercised over the fellowship of man with God, so that these sermons are sermons indeed. His name is Charles Wenyon, M.D. Dr. Wenyon is not, we say, a theologian in disguise. He is not a theologian at all. If he were, he would not say: 'Paul's word, "As in Adam all die," must be understood of our animal nature.'

There is a proper mixture of religion and ethics in *The Coming of the Kingdom*, by the Rev. Henry Burton, M.A., D.D. (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). The great texts provide the religion, the small texts the ethics. For example: the text of the first sermon is 'Thy Kingdom come'; the text of the second is 'Let us pass over unto the other side'; then the subject of the third sermon is the Word of God, the text being, 'The seed is the word of God.' Thus we have great texts and little texts, religion and ethics, alternately; it is so pretty much throughout the book. But on the whole Dr. Burton is fond of the unusual text, and it is undeniable that the unusual text has certain arrest in it, though one may doubt if it is worth choosing for that alone.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have added to their 'Golden Treasury' series: (1) *The Way to God* and *Heaven* (in one volume), by D. L. Moody; (2) *Pleasure and Profit* and *Anecdotes* (also in one volume), by the same; and *The Bells of Is*, by F. B. Meyer (1s. net each).

A good modern Jewish preacher has something to teach us. *The Oral Law* is the title of such a preacher's collection of sermons, the preacher being the Rev. M. Hyamson, B.A., LL.B., Dayan of the United Synagogue (Nutt; 3s. 6d. net). We have been most instructed by the sermon on 'Life.' With other edifying things, it contains an anecdote of Rabbi Eliezer. His disciples came to him one day, just as the rich young ruler did to Jesus, and asked, 'Master, teach us the ways of life, so that thereby we may merit eternal bliss.' What was his answer? 'Be heedful of the respect and honour due to your fellow-men. Keep your children from idle speculation, and place them between the knees of scholars. And when you pray, realize before Whom it is that you are praying. Thus will you enjoy life eternal.'

When the Rev. Malcolm James M'Leod, minister of Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas in New York City, read the text about the unsearchable riches of Christ, it occurred to him that a fine series of sermons could be made by showing how the riches of Christ was manifested in forgiveness, in experience, in power, in trust, in encouragement, in refuge, in influence, and in rest. He found a text for each, and so well were the sermons received that he published the whole in a volume, giving it the title of *The Unsearchable Riches* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). It is of course an inexhaustible subject, as the Apostle tells us, and another preacher might give us another volume just as edifying and as glorifying as this.

The Warburton Lectures are sermons. The course for the years 1907 to 1911 was delivered by the Rev. M. G. Glazebrook, D.D., Canon of Ely. The subject was *The End of the Law* (Rivingtons; 5s. net).

'The End of the Law'—what does that mean? 'The contention is that He in whom so many diverse problems of human life find their solution, must be more than a prophet; and that He, upon whose person so many lines of human aspiration

converge and find satisfaction, owes that central position in history to divine appointment.' So it is not the Mosaic Law only, it is the whole law of God; that law which is written on fleshy tables of the heart as well as on tables of stone. Yet Canon Glazebrook makes the Old Testament the basis of his exposition. He is satisfied if he is able to show that the Old Testament is laid open in the New, the New Testament being nothing more or less than the person, life, and work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Two notable volumes by notable preachers are published by Mr. Robert Scott. One is by the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, M.A. Its title is *Here and Hereafter* (3s. 6d. net). It opens with five addresses which were given on consecutive days at the midday service in St. Paul's Cathedral. The titles of the addresses are Conviction, Conversion, Consecration, Continuance, and Communion. They are an evangelist's finest appeal, sincere, unexaggerated, and most moving. There follow some sermons on the churchman's duty, and then the volume ends with a course of four on the future, which are quite as striking as the evangelistic course at the beginning. Mr. Watts-Ditchfield has no difficulty in offering life beyond death as an encouragement to godly living now.

The other volume is wholly occupied with the future. Its title is *The Life Hereafter* (2s. net); its author is the Rev. Edward Hicks, D.D., D.C.L.

Another volume of sermons for soldiers has been published by Miss Amy Debenham. The title is *On Guard* (Robert Scott; 1s. 6d. net). But Miss Debenham says we must not call them sermons; they are readings. We wish all the sermons that are called sermons had as clear a point and kept to it.

The Ven. Archdeacon Wilberforce owes much of his popularity as a preacher to the fact that he is more interested in the twentieth century than in the first. He is always ready to throw over the first century when it seems to him to have made a mistake. 'The second coming,' he says, 'is not a local descent through space of an objective personality in the midst of a cosmic cataclysm, but the outpouring of the Spirit of the Christ upon the hearts of men, and His coming in power to individual souls.' Dr. Wilberforce calls himself a man of moods, and defends the moody preacher; but his variations are superficial. The man is always a Londoner of to-day, feeling and seeking to relieve the distress of modern Londoners. The title of his book is *Power with God* (Elliot Stock; 3s. net).

Virginibus Puerisque.

Three volumes have been issued this month containing sermons for children.

The biggest (you may judge if the best) is *Manna for Young Pilgrims*, by the Rev. Charles Jerdan, M.A., LL.B. (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 5s.). This is, we think, the fifth handsome volume of children's sermons which Mr. Jerdan has published. Every one of the sermons in every one of the volumes has something in it. Never are the little ones sent away empty. And scarcely any children's preacher is easier to remember. We may quote a sermon next month.

But meantime let us quote a sermon out of Mr. Cecil Nicholson's *The Wonderful City* (Allenson; 1s.). The volume contains twenty-six just such as this:—

How to Win by Losing.

'He humbled himself.'—Ph 2^8.

Let me begin with a story which was told to me by a fellow-student of mine. My friend was the minister in a village where lives a man who is the greatest all-round cricketer in the world. One summer, owing to a slight lameness, this cricketer was at home for a few days. He spent some of his time with two little boys—his own boy and my friend's boy.

One day, my friend's boy, whose age was about eight, rushed into the house in great excitement. He cried out, 'Father! father! We've been playing at cricket, and we've beaten Mr. Hirst.'

There are not many boys who could boast of having beaten George Hirst at cricket. How was it these two little boys managed it? It was just because he humbled himself. He said to himself, 'I'll give these little boys a chance. I won't make any big drives or hook strokes. I won't bowl any last balls or any deadly swervers. I'll let them get some runs.' That was how they beat him. 'He

humbled himself.' It was no disgrace to him. It was a great honour. He did it to give delight to the boys, and to teach them how to play.

Not long since I read a very fine book. It was the Life of James Gilmour. He went from an English College to be a missionary in Mongolia. The people he lived amongst were some of the strangest in the world. They were very hard to teach. So James Gilmour went and lived in tents like theirs, amidst the smoke and dirt and filth. He wore clothes like theirs, and ate their kind of food. He did not gain many of them over, but he taught some of them to love him so much that for many years they remembered him and called him Our Gilmour.' How did he do it? 'He humbled himself.' He did it because he loved them, and to teach them the love of God.

These words were first written about Jesus Christ: 'He humbled himself.' Though He lived at the Father's right hand in glory, He laid aside His glory just as George Hirst laid aside his skill; like Gilmour, He left home, which was heaven, and came to live amongst men, and live like men, bearing their pains and sorrows, that He might teach them of the Heavenly Father. 'He humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.'

What He did, we are to do, so far as we can. We don't like to be humbled—it does not feel pleasant; but if we humble ourselves to help some one else, we gain the highest honour. It is very hard, but it is very grand, and all grand things are hard to reach; and, for boys and girls who are worth their salt, that is just the reason why they should try to reach them.

The third volume this month is called *Children's Story-Sermons* (Revell; 3s. net). Its author is the Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, D.D., of Chicago. What are Story-Sermons? Here is one:—

A Boy who was a Hero.

Not all the heroes are in story-books. No indeed. Some of them are living quite close to us, but we would hardly guess that they are heroes, because a real hero never tells about the splendid things he does. A real hero, you know, always keeps his heroism to himself. You can always be sure when a boy tells you about the great brave things he has done that he is a bully and not a hero. A hero never talks about himself.

Here is a real hero story. It is about a boy who ran an elevator in an old shaky, shackly office building in Philadelphia. The people who knew him called him Billy. He was a lean, freckle-faced boy, with red hair, and nobody guessed that Billy was a hero. But he was, as this story will show. One day the old building began to tremble and shake, and then one of the walls fell out, and the crowd gathered in the street and looked up at the windows of the building where the men and women and little children were, and wondered what would become of them. But Billy never waited to wonder, but ran his old elevator up to the topmost story and came back with it crowded with frightened women and little children. He did that a second time, and a third, and a fourth, and a fifth, and a sixth. Up and down he went for nine times until only one side of the building was standing and the shaft of the elevator was bare and was swaying to and fro like a tree in the wind. The policemen tried to drag the boy away from his post, and the great crowd cried for him to stop; but he pulled the chain and began to rise again to the upper floor. 'There's two men up there yet,' said Billy, and away he went to the top, facing death every minute, but never waiting to guess what the end might be. Then through the cloud of dust the old elevator was seen coming down, and in it there were three people. As it touched the ground, the other wall fell out, but the two men and Billy came out into the street unhurt. You should have heard the people cheer! They knew then that Billy, with his red hair and his freckled face, was a hero, and they wanted to catch him and carry him on their shoulders, make him give a speech, and take up a collection for him; but Billy could not be found anywhere. He had slipped off unnoticed through the crowd, for it was supper-time, and he had gone home to his mother.

This story does not need any sermon. If it did, all that the sermon could say would be: 'Do things, don't talk about them. Do brave, kind, heroic, beautiful things, not because people see you, but because you are a hero at heart, and because there are brave, kind, heroic, beautiful things to be done, and because God sees you.'

For the Work of the Ministry.

The Rev. Andrew Benvie, B.D., has written a volume, chiefly out of his own experience, and called it *The Minister at Work* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net). It is a very proper book to have at hand in the study. Mr. Benvie deals with the decline in church-going. He believes that the chief cause of it is uninteresting preaching. 'We need more efficiency in the pulpit. We need preachers who are better trained in the art of oratory, so that the spiritual wants of the people may be fully met.' And he advocates extempore preaching, giving his own experience.

'I had written and read my sermons for ten years—two weekly—when, as it chanced, an occasion came which prevented my finishing the writing of my second sermon. As I never used an old sermon, I had to do my best with the unfinished one. Knowing what I had to say, I ventured to finish it extempore. I succeeded. That success was a lesson. The experiment was repeated with half the sermon unwritten. Then, finding I could think on my feet as well as at the desk, and find at the moment the language required, I wrote an introduction only, with notes of the headings. This at length was found unnecessary, and for the last five-and-twenty years or more I have preached twice every Sunday without "the paper." Note, however, that this never meant in any degree relaxation of effort in any of the departments of preparation. Full of the subject, and with an orderly outline clearly apprehended, supplemented by reading and illustration, I found the work of preaching increasingly pleasant, and, I believe, effective. There is hardly a minister who will fail in this matter if he make determined resolution to succeed.'

After this encouragement, let us study *The Art of Effective Public Speaking*, by Ernest Pertwee (Routledge; 3s. 6d.). Mr. Benvie does not advise us to study a manual like this, and no doubt effective public speaking needs practice; but it is possible to practise what is bad, and so perpetuate mischief. The study of such a book as this, in default of a master in elocution or a candid critic, will certainly repay the cost of it. Mr. Pertwee is the last to say, 'Read, and do not'; practice is the keystone of his building.

Mr. Benvie describes a working pastor, whereas Dr. Samuel Charles Black, of the Presbyterian Church, Toledo, Ohio, describes a working church. And what a business a working church is in the eyes of an energetic modern American Presbyterian! First there is the outlook. Those who are going to build this working church must realize the world's need and the Church's opportunity. Next there is the approach to the local community who have to be won. Then there are certain general but necessary elements—the missionary spirit, the spirit of evangelism, the spirit of fellowship, and music. After that come the auxiliaries—the Sabbath School, the Men's Clubs and the Women's Societies, the Young People's Societies, and other agencies. All these things are described in detail but with much liveliness; and if it is a large volume, it is far from being a dull one. The inevitable doubt is whether too much is left with organization, too little with that Spirit who breatheth as He willeth. The title of the book is *Building a Working Church* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

The Sunday School.

There is no need to say that the literature on the Sunday School is American. There is, however, an English pamphlet. It is an address on *The Subject-Matter of Sunday-School Teaching* (Allenson; 3d.).

The books are (1) *How to Teach a Sunday-School Lesson* (2s. 6d. net), by H. E. Carmack; and (2) *The Work of the Sunday School* (3s. net), by the Rev. Ray Clarkson Harker, D.D. Both are published by Mr. Revell. They are both far too good, far too advanced and scientific and thorough, to be of use in this country.

Prayer.

Begin with the *Free Church Service-Manual*, arranged by Mr. F. B. Meyer, B.A. (National Free Church Council; 1s. net).

Next, *Real Prayer* (Revell; 1s. 6d. net), a volume by the Rev. Cortland Myers, D.D., which encourages to sincerity and reality in prayer, and shows that out of it come Real Power, Real Presence, and Real Purity, and that the way of it is Real Plea, Real Persistence, and Real Purpose.

Messrs. Nisbet have issued in black and gold a

substantial volume of *Daily Readings and Prayers* (2s. 6d. net), being a manual for family worship and private reading, compiled and composed by a layman.

Last of all, consider the fact of a second volume of *Pulpit Prayers*, by the late Alexander Maclaren of Manchester (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.). As in the first volume, the prayers are long and a little wordy, for they were not prepared for publication, but taken down as they were spoken. But they are true, spiritual, large-horizoned, and hopeful.

Contributions and Comments.

Eshmun and other Divine Names.

Having, like Professor Hommel, been much occupied with the Semitic names of gods, I would ask leave to supplement this acute scholar's communication. Several important results have rewarded my study of the Elephantinê god-names, and several confirmations of views expressed by me in *The Two Religions of Israel* and in *Traditions and Beliefs*. Among these views is the identification of the name Eshmun with the name Ishmael, and the combination of both with the Ashima of 2 K 17^{30}, the *ashmath* of Am 8^{14} and the *asham* of Hab 1^{11} (see *Traditions*, pp. 18, note 3, 46, 47; *Two Religions*, pp. 367, 400). The Elephantinê papyri attest a compound divine name אשמביתאל, where the first part of the name must have come from some corrupt form of ישמעאל, such as אשמן or אשמון. This latter theory has been already referred to by Baudissin (*Adonis und Esmun*, p. 214, note 3), who rejects it on an insufficient ground. It appears to me certain. Baudissin prefers to connect this אשם with the אשימא of 2 K 17^{30}, not seeing that אשימא is closely connected with אשמן. Hommel writes quite convincingly on the form אשימא, but apparently he has not brought his acute mind to bear on what I may call the North Arabian theory of the origin of Eshmun. He speaks, indeed, of the connexion between Israel and Hamath in religious matters, but evidently means the northern Hamath. I will only add that the divine names אשמביתאל and חרמביתאל must be considered together. חרם is clearly parallel to אשם; the one is Yarham or Yerahme'el; the other Ishmael. ביתאל is a very early modification of ימבאל, a corruption of ישמעאל. The Jews of Elephantinê must have belonged to a largely North Arabian race.

T. K. Cheyne.

Oxford.

A Postscript.

In No. 19 (Papyrus 18), col. 7, lines 5 and 6, of the book recently published by Ed. Sachau on Aramaic Papyrus from Elephantinê, there is mentioned, immediately after Jahweh, two Angels who bear the names אשמביתאל (Ashma-Bet-el) and ענתביתאל ('Anat-Bet-el). The former receives of the store of gold of 31 keresh and 8 shekels the sum of 7 keresh (1 keresh contains 10 shekels), the latter 12 keresh, while Jahweh Himself (according to line 4) received 12 keresh and 6 shekels (a misprint for 8 shekels?). Professor Erman has already compared (in Sachau, pp. xxv and 83) אשימא of 2 K 17^{30}, but not אשמת of Am 8^{14}. Bethel is, as various proper names in Sachau show, the deified dwelling-place of Jahweh, and the two Angels אשם and ענת correspond, in my opinion, to the *πάρεδροι* of the Sun-god spoken of on p. 122 f of my book, *Grundriss der geogr. u. gesch.*, etc., in which I would now rather find Venus as the morning and evening star than as the waxing and waning moon.

F. Hommel.

Munich.

The Pounds and the Talents.

In connexion with the note on the parables of the Pounds and the Talents by Mr. Eugene Stock, which appeared in the June number of The Expository Times, it may be of interest to recall the view taken by the late Professor A. B. Bruce of Glasgow in his exposition of these parables. That distinguished scholar grouped three parables together, the Labourers in the Vineyard, the Pounds, and the Talents (Mt $20^{1\text{-}16}$, Lk $19^{12\text{-}27}$, Mt $25^{14\text{-}30}$), as dealing with the same subject, work and wages in the Kingdom of God.[1] While recognizing,

[1] *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, Book I. chap. vii.

as all must do, the strong points of likeness in the two latter parables, and admitting that many scholars from Calvin downwards (Strauss, Bleek, Ewald, and others) have been led to the opinion that the stories as we have them are versions of the same parable, Professor Bruce takes the opposite view, and maintains that there are two parables, variations indeed on the same theme, but 'variations originating with the Master Himself. Not due to the blunders of reporters, or to the modifying influence of inaccurate tradition.'[1] The reasons for this opinion are to be found mainly in the remarkable manner in which the lessons of each parable fit in with, and form part of, the whole teaching of Christ.

All the three parables when closely examined appear to stand together as one whole, and present a very complete view of the principles which govern work and the reward of work in the Heavenly Kingdom. Thus the Parable of the Labourers and their different hours of service, teaches the supreme importance of right motive in work for the Kingdom. The grateful and zealous service of the last hired labourers, though it be but for one hour, is more valuable in the eyes of the Master than a full day's work done in the grudging, grumbling, and hireling spirit which seems to have characterized those who bore the burden and heat of the day.

The story of the Pounds teaches that where all start alike the amount done is a fair measure of the reward due, and that each is expected to make the best possible use of his pound. The servant who gains ten pounds not only gets ten cities, as against the five given to his fellow, but, from the Master's words of commendation, we are made to feel that, though both have done well, the first is distinctly more deserving than the other.

The lessons of these two parables are completed by that taught in the tale of the Talents. The servants here receive varying amounts, five talents, two talents, one talent, and the man who uses two so as to make four is commended in the same words as he who makes ten by the diligent use of five. 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.'

Where ability varies this must in fairness be taken into account in reckoning the reward, and the Master judges not by mere bulk alone, but takes account of the varied gifts with which He has endowed His servants.

This last point, the unequal endowment in the story of the Talents, as contrasted with the equality shown in that of the Pounds, seems to separate the two parables so distinctly that it is not easy to see how one could arise as a version of the other. The outward resemblance is of course great, but while similar lessons may be deduced from subordinate elements in each, the point and centre of the two stories is entirely distinct. It is on this ground, as Professor Bruce points out, that Schleiermacher regards the parables as separate. Each story is fitted to illustrate a different aspect of life in the service of the Kingdom.

In some respects, as Mr. Stock shows in his interesting interpretation, all servants receive equal endowment from the Master, and their reward, in this case, is rightly estimated by the result which each produces in the use of that endowment. This is the teaching of the Parable of the Pounds. On the other hand, it is equally apparent as a fact of life that in regard to many matters endowment is by no means equal, but very much the reverse. In the Talents parable this fact is recognized, and it is laid down as a principle of the Kingdom that equal diligence and faithfulness in the use of unequal gifts is rewarded equally by the allwise Master.

The view of Professor Bruce on the whole subject, as given in the work before mentioned, is well worth attention, and such considerations appear to go far to confirm Mr. Stock's position, and justify the opinion that the parables are not one, but two.

ROBERT CANDLISH.

Aberdeen.

[1] *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 181.

Exact Renderings.

MINISTERS who are in the habit of reading, and always consulting, the original, sometimes find words of which a more exact rendering might be given than is found even in the Revised Version. No doubt the exact translation may give us a somewhat uncouth word for our language, and sometimes it may require a word which has already been appropriated to another meaning. But such an uncouth or even inadmissible word gives a fuller and finer meaning. Two illustrations of this may here be given.

1. The one is in Jn 1^{14}, Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ

ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. In the Revised Version the translation is, 'And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us.' In the margin it is indicated that a better translation would be 'tabernacled' instead of 'dwelt.' But might not the word ἐσκήνωσεν be still better rendered if we read, 'And the Word became flesh, and "Shechinahed" among us'? The Greek letters of the word suggest the Hebrew word שְׁכִינָה, to which the late Dr. Dods says there is probably an allusion. Why not then understand that the Word, the λόγος, as in the man Christ Jesus, is as the Shechinah in the tabernacle; and expound the meaning of the clause as if it were thus translated, 'And the Word became flesh, and Shechinahed among us'? Does not this reading tell better than any other the place and the function of the λόγος in the σάρξ? The λόγος Shechinahed among us.

2. The other illustration is in Eph 1[6], Εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ. In the Authorized Version this is translated, 'To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved.' In the Revised Version we have, 'To the praise of the glory of his grace, which he freely bestowed on us (or, as in margin, wherewith he endued us) in the Beloved.' It is to be regretted that we cannot use the word 'grace' as a verb in this case. For undoubtedly Paul means to teach that all that is done to us and for us in the matter of our redemption is of the grace of God in Christ; and that God did this, and that, and everything of grace; and he sums it all up by saying that He *Graced* us in the Beloved. With a brief explanation we may thus read,—'To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he graced us in the Beloved.'

JAMES MATTHEW.

Haddington.

Entre Nous.

Recent Biography.

The King comes first. So in this survey of the biography of the month, let us begin with *The King to his People*. It is a republication of the Speeches and Messages of His Majesty George v. The style of the book is a triumph—most effective in all respects. And the contents will be a revelation to those who have not observed very closely how many are the public duties that a king is called upon to perform, and how consummately well King George can perform them. The publishers are Messrs. Williams & Norgate (5s. net).

The first volume of the biography of Pitt, by Dr. J. Holland Rose, was well received. The new volume will obtain as sincere a welcome. Its title is *William Pitt and the Great War* (Bell; 16s. net).

Dr. Holland Rose writes biography as biography. He does not write it as history, not even the biography of Pitt. That is to say, he makes the personality of his hero (if the word may be used in the novelist's sense), and not the politics of his time, the chief interest of his book. And, more than that, he has the rare gift of so writing that the centre of interest of each event is the attitude to it of the man whose life he is describing. Napoleon is much in evidence here; and wherever Napoleon is he is prominent. Yet even Napoleon never takes the first place in the mind. He may have been a greater man than Pitt, that question does not rise; he is never the secret of the reader's strong desire to continue the reading of the book.

It is not easy to state the estimate which Dr. Holland Rose has formed of Pitt. There is no gathering together of impressions. But after all is over there is left a sense of single-minded greatness. And there is no lack of those incidents which reveal character. Perhaps the most delicate of all is the love episode of the year 1797. Dr. Holland Rose claims to have thrown new light upon that matter. This is how he tells the story:

'The voice of rumour, in his case always unfair, charged him with utter indifference to feminine charms. His niece, Lady Hester Stanhope, who later on had opportunities of observing him closely, vehemently denied the charge, declaring that he was much impressed by beauty in women, and noted the least defect, whether of feature, demeanour, or dress. She declared that, on one occasion, while commending her preparations for the ballroom, he suggested the looping up of one particular fold. At once she recognized the voice of the expert and hailed the experiment as an artistic triumph. Hester's recollections, it is true, belong to the lonely years spent in the Lebanon, when she indulged in ecstatic or spiteful outbursts; and we therefore question her statement that Pitt was once so enamoured of a certain Miss W——, who became Mrs. B——s of Devonshire, as to drink wine out of her shoe. But Hester's remarks

are detailed enough to refute the reports of his unnatural insensibility, which elicited coarse jests from opponents; and we may fully trust that severe critic of all Pitt's friends, when, recalling a special visit to Beckenham Church, she pronounced the Honourable Eleanor Eden gloriously beautiful.

'To this bright vivacious girl of twenty years Pitt's affections went forth in the winter of 1796–1797; and she reciprocated them. Every one agrees that Eleanor combined beauty with good sense, sprightliness with tact. Having had varied experiences during Auckland's missions to Paris, Madrid, and The Hague, she had matured far beyond her years. In mental endowments she would have been a fit companion even to Pitt; and she possessed a rich store of the social graces in which he was somewhat deficient. In fact, here was his weak point as a political leader. He and his colleagues had no *salon* which could vie with those of the Whig grandees. The accession of Portland had been a social boon; but Pitt and his intimate followers exerted little influence on London Society. He and Grenville were too stiff. Neither Dundas nor Wilberforce moved in the highest circles. Portland, Spencer, and Windham held somewhat aloof, and Leeds, Sydney, and others had been alienated. Accordingly, the news that Pitt was paying marked attentions to Auckland's eldest daughter caused a flutter of excitement. Her charm and tact warranted the belief that in the near future the Prime Minister would dominate the social sphere hardly less than the political.

'Among his friends who knew how warm a heart beat under that cold exterior, the news inspired the hope that here was the talisman which would reveal the hidden treasures of his nature. The stiff form would now unbend; the political leader would figure as a genial host; the martinet would become a man. Assuredly their estimate was correct. Pitt's nature needed more glow, wider sympathies, a freer expression. A happy marriage would in any case have widened his outlook and matured his character. But a union with Eleanor Eden would have supplied to him the amenities of life. We picture her exerting upon him an influence not unlike that which Wordsworth believed that his sister had exerted upon his being:

> Thou didst plant its crevices with flowers,
> Hang it with shrubs that twinkle in the breeze,
> And teach the little birds to build their nests
> And warble in its chambers.

It was not to be. After toying with this day-dream, Pitt suddenly broke away to Downing Street. His letter to Auckland, written there on 20th January 1797, announced the decision of the Minister in chillingly correct terms. In pathetically halting and laboured phraseology he implied that he had throughout observed a correct aloofness. After five long sentences of apology to the father, he proceeded thus:

> Whoever may have the good fortune ever to be united to her is destined to more than his share of human happiness. Whether, at any rate, I could have had any ground to hope that such would have been my lot, I am in no degree entitled to guess. I have to reproach myself for ever having indulged the idea on my own part as far as I have done, without asking myself carefully and early enough what were the difficulties in the way of its being realized. I have suffered myself to overlook them too long, but having now at length reflected as fully and as calmly as I am able on every circumstance that ought to come under my consideration (at least as much for her sake as for my own), I am compelled to say that I find the obstacles to it decisive and insurmountable.

'Auckland had a right to feel the deepest pain at this official missive. The matter had been discussed in newspapers. Indeed, a caricaturist ventured to publish a sketch showing Pitt as Adam conducting Eve to the nuptial bower in the garden of Eden, while behind it squatted Satan as a toad, leering hatred through the features of Fox. It is to be hoped that Auckland did not know of this indelicate cartoon when he replied to Pitt. That letter has very properly been destroyed. But we have Pitt's second letter to Auckland, in which he again assures him how deeply he is affected by hearing of "the sentiments of another person, unhappily too nearly interested in the subject in question." He adds these moving words: "Believe me, I have not lightly or easily sacrificed my best hopes and earnest wishes to my conviction and judgment." Auckland's reply of 23rd January reveals the grief of his wife and daughter. For two or three days they remained in absolute solitude, and that, too, in a household remarkable for domestic affection. To Pitt also the decision was a matter of deep pain and lifelong regret. Thenceforth he trod the path of duty alone. On 7th February the Archbishop of Canterbury wrote to Auckland (his brother-in-law) that Pitt lived in seclusion and seemed dreamy. At a recent Council meeting his face was swollen and unhealthy looking. Probably this was the time at which Pitt informed Addington that he must take the helm of State.'

Mr. Henry Mayers Hyndman has written his autobiography. He calls it *A Record of an Adventurous Life* (Macmillan; 15s. net). For Mr. Hyndman has been and is a socialist, and in the advocacy of socialism he has been all over the world, and has come into touch with all sorts and conditions of men. He has had adventures enough; yet he has always been ready for one adventure more. Mr. Hyndman is a socialist of the pronounced and pugilistic kind. He cannot get fighting enough; he cannot do enough to show how unpalatable a thing socialism can be made to appear.

Like Mr. Blatchford, Mr. Hyndman's sympathies are with the down dog. So are the sympathies of the Lord Jesus Christ. But there is a difference. Mr. Blatchford and Mr. Hyndman sympathize with the down dog simply because he is down; the Lord Jesus Christ in order to raise him up. The moment he is up, or the moment he shows the least inclination to rise, Mr. Blatchford and Mr. Hyndman have lost their interest in him. Mr. Hyndman has great sympathy, for example, and great sorrow of heart for the Mormons. He says: 'The upholders of, and profiters by, the brothels and dens of debauchery in New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago were horrified at the idea of taking several women to wife simultaneously instead of dealing with them, without marriage, successively. The higher standard of this Christian morality was at once apparent, and the newspapers proclaimed widely how shocked all decent people must be at such unseemly social relations as prevailed in Utah.' This example shows us why it is that Mr. Hyndman is in sympathy with the down dog. It is not so much because he is down as because the other dog is up. So let all respectable people who want to see themselves as one other man sees them read this book. It is severe, but it may be salutary.

Dr. Lindsay Alexander is now found among the 'Little Books on Religion.' The author is E. T. M'Laren (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net). It is a pleasant anecdotal life. '"Jims" (but is not the proper spelling Jeems?) was gardener at Pinkieburn when Dr. Alexander was a boy, and still held office when he became master there. On telling him of some change he intended to make in the avenue, Jims sturdily replied, "Na, na, Doctor, that'll no' dae at a'." "Well, but I have resolved to have it done," Dr. Alexander said; and when again it was vetoed, he quietly reminded Jims that he was there to carry out orders. "Nae doot in a certain sense that's true," was the prompt reply; "still I'm here to prevent you spilin' the property." When, however, the alterations were an accomplished fact, and approved of, Jims took his full share of the credit. "Nane o' your landscape gardeners here; me and the Doctor manage a'."'

The new volume of the 'Heroes of the World' series, published by Messrs. Seeley, Service, & Co., is entitled *Heroes of Modern Africa* (5s.). The author is Mr. Edward Gilliat, M.A. Mr. Gilliat has already written three volumes of the series, and we know what to expect from him. Here the narrative is as thrilling as ever and the conversations are as realistic. Here also is the same desire to let us see the men as they really were, and the incidents as they actually occurred.

Father Pollock and his Brother (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net) is not a successful biography. It has little interest as a book, and it never gives us a clear sight of any of the men. Father Pollock was once famous as a ritualist in Birmingham. Perhaps the volume is meant as a vindication, if that is necessary now. There are anecdotes in it. This is the best:—

'A working man had a vision one night. He saw his father and mother, who had died some years before. They stood before him; an Angel stood between them, and a serpent was near the Angel's feet. He felt a sting in his breast; the serpent stung him, as he thought. The pain made him start up and leap out of bed. Presently he went to bed again; the pain had not yet left him. The figures then vanished away. His wife saw nothing. He was at the time a sober, industrious man. About a year after the vision he became a drunkard. He has kept his family in poverty and misery ever since. A clergyman visited him one Sunday afternoon in the spring of 1873. Talking of his sins, he told the story. He said he had often told it before, but none seemed able to explain it. Every one said, "It's a vision"; and that was all they could say of it.'

The Rev. Alexander Whyte, D.D., Principal of New College, Edinburgh, has published another

religious biography. *James Fraser, Laird of Brea*, is the subject and title of it (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 2s. 6d. net). The laird is described as 'Parish Minister of Culross; Bass Rock, Blackness, and Newgate Prisoner; and Author of "The Book of the Intricacies of my Heart and Life."' And to those who do not know the Laird of Brea, what a discovery of delight this book will be. Of course it is a discovery of the Minister of St. George's and Principal of New College also. For all the writers of biography in the world might write about James Fraser and not make a book like this. There is not merely the entrancement of this laird's religious life, there is also the close searching which every page compels the reader to make into his own life.

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have also issued a new edition of Dr. James Robertson's reminiscence of *Lady Blanche Balfour* (1s. net).

To the 'Notre Dame' series of Lives of the Saints has been added *St. Anselm* (Sands; 3s. 6d. net). The author is not named, in accordance with the rule of the series. And it is again a purely popular book, built on other men's foundations, but built honestly and truthfully.

We have read every word of the new edition of *Professor Elmslie: A Biography*, by Sir W. Robertson Nicoll (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d.). It is so human and so compassable that no man, however busy, will fail to go to the end. And it has good things in it. As this. Candlish was one of the professors in the New College in Elmslie's time. One day a student's written discourse was being reported on. This was Candlish's criticism: 'All I have got to say about this discourse is' (raising his voice), 'that one half should be struck out, and' (lowering it again) 'it doesn't matter which half.'

Mr. Dugald Macfadyen has written brief biographies of certain *Men of the Spirit* (Headley; 2s. 6d. net). He gathers them into classes—Martyrs, Monks, Knights, Puritans, and Citizens—and talks pleasantly about each of them and about the class to which each of them belongs.

Whether she has ever written anything before or not, Ruth Putnam is one of the best biographers of our day. Her *William the Silent*, one of the series, entitled 'Heroes of the Nations' (Putnam; 5s. net), shows at once that she prepares herself by close study and then gives herself in glad confidence to a delineation of the character and life of her hero. No question of right or wrong is intruded. Such 'moral' as the story contains falls imperceptibly upon the conscience. We are simply interested in the march of events, and we leave even the estimate of the Prince's character to the silence of unconscious impression.

What do you know of *The Bas Bleu*? Is it possible you can be ignorant of a work of which Johnson said that there was no name in poetry that might not be glad to own it? Read *Hannah More*, a biographical study by Annette M. B. Meakin (Smith, Elder & Co.; 14s. net), and you will learn about *The Bas Bleu* and its author, and you will be ready to say that you have had both instruction and entertainment.

It is good to recover the days that are past; and in this manner, the manner of a well-written and reliable biography, they are recovered very pleasantly. The men and women into whose society the biographer brings us, are great enough to demand our time. But there will be no sense of duty done, only a sense of pleasure obtained when this biography is read. And Hannah More herself is always the centre of interest.

Is it proper to bring David Masson's *Memories of Two Cities* under biography? It is quite proper. For although the cities of Edinburgh and Aberdeen were manifestly very dear to memory as cities, it was nevertheless the men in them that gave their memory its keenest relish.

The papers which are now published under the title of *Memories of Two Cities: Edinburgh and Aberdeen* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 7s. 6d. net), appeared originally in the years 1864–1865 as contributions to *Macmillan's Magazine*, which had recently been started under David Masson's editorship. It is a surprise that they have not been published sooner, for their interest is astonishingly great, at least to men who have any interest in either city. There is perhaps no form of literature that is the occasion of more disappointment than reminiscences. But Professor Masson's chief interest was not in himself and his own small doings. He appreciated the movements of the

time that made history; he knew the men. With Chalmers, with Christopher North, and Sir William Hamilton, with Hugh Miller and De Quincey, with Dr. Kidd of Aberdeen and with Dr. Melvin he had an intimacy and friendship that seems, now at least, most rare. He appreciated the great events in which these men had a great share, he appreciated the men themselves. He had himself, indeed, no little part in the things which made Scotland notable in education and literature. We spoke of his own small doings, but his doings never were small. These memories are written down with great simplicity and unconsciousness, but they are the memories which only a keen mind and a large heart could entertain. It is a book which will itself make memorable the literature of the present season. Let us quote a page of it:

'Two visits of distinguished strangers, which Aberdeen received while Campbell and Beattie and others of Reid's deipnosophists were its social notabilities, are duly recorded in its annals: Dr. Johnson's visit, with Bozzy for his pilot, in 1773, and a flying visit of Burns in 1787. Both were, in their way, failures. Every honour was shown to Johnson, and they made him a freeman of the town; but the deipnosophists were afraid of him, and, though they gathered round him and invited him to their houses, were shy to speak in his presence. "We sat contentedly at our inn," says Bozzy, speaking of their last night in the town, "and Dr. Johnson then became merry, and observed how little we had either heard or said at Aberdeen—that the Aberdonians had not started a single mawkin (*i.e.* hare) for us to pursue." I am glad to be able to give a hitherto unpublished anecdote of Johnson's visit to Aberdeen, which partly redeems the credit of the town, thus lowered by the pusillanimity of its big-wigs. While Johnson was in the town, a house in one of its streets, called Huckster Row, was undergoing the process of being "harled" (*i.e.* whitewashed) outside with a mixture of lime and gravel. Either because the process interested the Doctor, or because he was in an absent fit, as he was passing that way, he stopped underneath the ladder on which the man who was doing the work stood with his bucket of "harl" and his trowel. He stood a long while, the man politely ceasing his work so as not to splash so grand-looking a stranger. But the man, being short-tempered, at length got tired; and, on Johnson's perceiving his impatience and calling up to him, "I hope I am not in your way, my man," answered at once, "Feint a bit are you in *my* way, gin you're nae in your nain" (Devil a bit are you in *my* way, if you're not in your own), at the same time resuming his work, and sending a splash of the "harl" from his trowel against the wall so as to give the Doctor's coat the benefit of the drippings. The anecdote may be no bad metaphor of the entire history of Johnson's visit to those outlandish parts.'

Poesy and Poetry.

Poesy is the art of making poetry, and poesy is itself a science. Dr. W. Winslow Hall has written a *Book of English Poesy* (Dent; 3s. 6d. net), treating it as a science, a science whose laws are reached by the proper scientific method of the induction of facts. But what is poetry? Dr. Hall's definition is in these words: 'Poetry is that which conveys information, along with some sort of pleasurable and emotional thrill, by means of a more or less rigidly-patterned form of words. It may take prose-form or verse-form.' Dr. Hall understands not only the science of poesy, but also the science of bookmaking. It is not a large book, but everything necessary is in it and all in order. Henceforward, if we will study this book as it deserves to be studied, there seems to be nothing to hinder any of us from becoming Miltons.

The study of the science of Poesy is properly followed by the study of *The Poetics of Aristotle*. The book in which to study the Poetics of Aristotle is that which has been written by Professor D. S. Margoliouth of Oxford under that title (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). It contains the translation from the Greek into English, and from Arabic into Latin, with a revised text, introduction, commentary, glossary, and onomasticon. The work began with the Arabic, as one might have expected. It is ended with the issue of this volume, which is not only the best edition of the Poetics we possess, but is a model for the editing of any author, and at the same time a proof that scholarship can be at once broad and thorough.

Messrs. Chatto & Windus have published a complete edition of *The Poetical Works of Bret Harte*, including 'some later verses' (2s. net in

cloth; or 3s. net in leather). Printed on fine paper, the volume is handy and light.

Horae Serenae is the title of a volume of poems by the Rev. Thomas Crawford, B.D., published by Mr. William Brown, of Edinburgh (3s. 6d. net). The poems have all the sense of the unseen and eternal in them, though sometimes they touch themes that are usually touched very lightly. Take the shortest that the book contains, to show Mr. Crawford's mastery of the art and his quotableness:

VISION.

All is pure, to the eye that's pure;
All, to the heart that knows, is wise;
Truth, to the true, abides most sure,
Love to the loving, never dies.

By the Way of the Gate: Poems and Dramas, by Charles Cayzer (Kegan Paul; 2 vols., 10s. net). The poems fill the first volume, the dramas the second. There are three dramas: 'David and Bathshua,' 'Donna Marina,' and 'Undine.' Mr. Cayzer, as a Roman Catholic, takes a favourable view of the character of Bathsheba (to use the familiar spelling). She is more sinned against than sinning, and the climax of the drama is her sorrow over the death of her son, a sorrow that David with difficulty turns into the joy of forgiveness. The last words of the drama are spoken by David:

He hath heard thy supplication, O my soul!
The years of travail draw now to an end.
And thou, O queenly heart!
Lovingly leal thro' that long, dread atonement,
Be thou partaker and consort of my joy—
This blessed joy, ensanctified by sorrow,
Of our complete reunion under God.
His hands shall guide us, and His peace enfold us,
Until we know Him as He truly is.

The poems vary greatly in character and in subject. The author himself divides them into Nature Poems, Love Poems, Sacred Poems, Lyrics (from the three Dramas), Historical and Political Poems, and Miscellaneous Poems. Of the sacred Poems take this. It is a brick to exhibit a building.

RENUNCIATION.

No man hath gain'd soul-mastery, without
Fierce self-renunciation—and the fight,
So hardly won, so perilous near to rout,
Widens Life's whole horizon to his sight.

Miss Agnes E. Drey is not simply a translator. Her *Poems* (St. Catherine Press) are *after* Verlaine, Maeterlinck, and others. Here is her way with a well-known sonnet by Michael Angelo—

DANTE.

He left our world to brave the black abyss,
And penetrated Purgatory and Hell,
Then, guided by high thought, saw God in bliss,
And brought true light to those on earth who dwell.

Star of pure light, with his far-piercing rays
He bared eternal secrets to our view,
And he received the thanks the world still pays,
The world that ever stones the prophet true.
For Dante was denied the meed of praise
In his own day, his virtue known too late:
The just man seldom wears his wreath of bays.
Yet were I such as he, 'twere no sad fate
To change for exile hard my happy state.

Anthologies.

Messrs. Herbert & Daniel have a series of 'Dainty Anthologies.' Of that series there have just appeared two volumes, one *The Book of the Seven Ages*, compiled by Henry W. Clark, and *The Charm of India*, edited by Claud Field (3s. 6d. net each). They are bound alike in a charming art cloth, with gilt top and uncut edges. But the best of them is themselves. Mr. Claud Field has made Eastern wisdom his peculiar possession. He knows all the intelligible corners of it. And he knows, too, the books that have been written by Englishmen on the East. This is an anthology of the best passages in the Indian biographies, the Indian histories, and even the Indian periodicals. Mr. Henry W. Clark's anthology is of poetry as well as of prose. He takes Shakespeare's Seven Ages and finds passages illustrating each of them. Thus we have a number of

passages on Infancy, a number on Childhood, and so on until we reach the 'last scene of all,' and Thackeray's account of the death of Colonel Newcome.

Some Children's Books.

Of the children's books this month five are issued by the S.P.C.K., two of which have an historical setting. The first is entitled *In a Royal Nursery*, by Gertrude Hollis (2s. 6d.), the 'royal nursery' being that of Charles the First and Henrietta Maria. The tale opens with an account of a royal visit to Sir William Vernon. His wife has just died, and his little daughter Moll is adopted by the King and Queen, and brought up with the little princes and princesses. The story of their life in the royal nursery during that eventful reign, down to the last pathetic meeting between Charles and his little son and daughter the night before his execution, is told in so interesting a manner that it is sure to delight all youthful readers. The last chapter carries us over a period of eleven years, and the book closes with the restoration of the Stuarts and the return of Charles the Second.

The second book takes us back to the time of Mary Queen of England. The title is *In the Days of Queen Mary*, and the author Edward E. Clarke, M.A., F.R.Hist.Soc. (2s.). This story opens with a scene at Chiddingly Place in Essex, the home of the twin brothers Ralph and William Jefferay, just before the death of Edward VI. of England, and closes with another scene in the same place after the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth. The period between these two scenes was a stirring one in the history of England, and the story of it, as told in this book, is also stirring. It centres round the brothers Ralph and William Jefferay, whose eventful career will be followed with deepest interest.

The other three books are entitled *The House of the Oak*, by H. A. Hinkson (2s.); *The Children of the Cliff*, by A. V. Dutton (1s. 6d.); and *The Burleighs*, by H. Elrington (1s.),—all of them just the sort of books that will be read with pleasure and enjoyment by the young folks fortunate enough to become their possessors. Each of the five is attractively bound, with a picture on the outside, and each contains a coloured frontispiece.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Dundas L. Erskine, Somerville, Cape Colony.

Illustrations for the Great Text for January must be received by the 1st of December. The text is Ps 139^7.

The Great Text for February is Is 28^{16}—'Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts,' or Durell's *The Self-Revelation of Our Lord* or Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for March is Ro 15^4—'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.' A copy of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for April is Is 30^{15}—'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.' A copy of Professor Clarke's *The Ideal of Jesus*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for May is Is $40^{6\text{-}8}$—'The voice of one saying, Cry. And one said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our Lord shall stand for ever.' A copy of Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, or Oswald Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

CAN the Sermon on the Mount be put in practice? The answer at present is an almost unanimous No. It is so nearly unanimous that we are arrested at once when a man declares without qualification that he believes it can be. Mr. A. E. FLETCHER, some time editor of one of the great London dailies, believes it can be. And in a book with the title of *The Sermon on the Mount and Practical Politics* (Griffiths; 2s. 6d. net) he says so.

Mr. FLETCHER says so, not only without qualification, but with clearness of thought and vigour of language. He does not enter upon questions of literary criticism. He takes it for granted that if Christ did not speak the Sermon on the Mount as we have it, the Sermon on the Mount as we have it expresses the mind of Christ. He proceeds to show that Christ intended it to be no unattainable ideal but an actual working rule of life, in just such a society of men as we live in.

What are the objections? One objection is, that any attempt whatever to govern on the principles laid down by Christ must be a failure, because Christianity itself has been a failure. That objection Mr. Fletcher meets by a straight denial. About 'Churchianity' he is not sure, and it is evident that he does not feel called upon to defend 'Churchianity.' But Christianity, he says, can never fail so long as its cardinal virtues, faith, hope, and love, have any influence over the mind and heart of man. He does not claim that the Christianity of the first century can be reproduced to-day. It seems to him that Christ Himself was a Communist and held centralized government to be an evil. Now it is his belief that in the present complex state of society, with international interests at stake, a central government is a necessity. What we ought to have is a series of communes, all held together by a central authority, but each with powers over its own affairs. He believes that in our day that is the nearest approach we can make to a perfect form of government, and he believes that such a form of government would be entirely after the mind of Christ.

Mr. FLETCHER does not go over every verse of the Sermon on the Mount to show how he would carry it out politically. He confines himself to the Beatitudes. He takes up the Beatitudes separately, and shows how they may be turned into practical politics. And if he succeeds with the Beatitudes, we may allow that he will succeed with all the rest.

The first Beatitude is 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' That, says Mr. FLETCHER, embodies the principle of all righteous legislation. He would take his stand upon that Beatitude and let the whole of the Sermon on the Mount be tried by it. He hears the opponent say, 'Blessed are the poor

in spirit' sounds better, but in the end it means no more than 'Blessed are the poor-spirited.' To Mr. FLETCHER it means the very opposite of that —the very opposite. For to be poor in spirit means to be in spirit, that is, in sympathy, with the poor. And to be in sympathy with the poor is to be mightily courageous in spirit, and that in all climates and in all times.

And when the opponent turns and taunts him, saying the poor in spirit are after all promised a reward—'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven,'—and therefore their action lacks disinterestedness, Mr. FLETCHER answers that to make such an objection is to miss the meaning of the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven is the ideal society. The poor in spirit do not look forward to some future personal reward; they have their reward already. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs *is* the kingdom of heaven.'

Professor Percy GARDNER of Oxford has written a book on *The Religious Experience of Saint Paul* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). It is a remarkable example of the shift that has taken place in the centre of New Testament study, a shift that was referred to last month in a notice of Professor LAKE'S volume on *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*. Professor GARDNER has still to touch some problems that are literary, but it is the religious problems that occupy him most. It is because of the study he has given to the religious world in which St. Paul lived that his book has its greatest value for us.

There is, for example, a chapter on the Pauline mystery. The word 'mystery,' says Professor GARDNER, and the ideas which it conveys, play a much larger part than is generally recognized in the writings and thought of St. Paul. And he gives a chapter of fifty pages to their exposition.

First, he takes the meaning of the word. It is very usual and indeed very natural, he says, that readers of the English Version of the Bible should attach to the word a meaning which it did not possess in the time of St. Paul. The word 'mystery' then implied institutions, societies, and ideas which were quite familiar to the people in the Mediterranean in the ages of Greek and Roman dominance, but which are quite unfamiliar to us. We have no mysteries in the ancient sense of the word. The term has been altered and degraded. The adjective 'mysterious,' which really governs the modern sense of the noun 'mystery,' is defined in some dictionaries as meaning enigmatical or incomprehensible. But if it were used in the Bible, it would mean 'of or belonging to the mysteries,' and the mysteries were not enigmatical or incomprehensible, though they were associated with a sacred awe.

Professor GARDNER explains what the mysteries were. They had three notable characteristics. First, they had all some rites of purification, whether ceremonial or moral, through which the *mystae* had to pass; next, they were all mysteries of communion with some deity; and thirdly, they all extended their view beyond the present life to that which is to come, securing for the initiated a happy reception in the world which lies beyond the grave.

The next step is to trace the history of the word in the Greek Bible. In the Old Testament it occurs only in the Book of Daniel. In the Synoptists, the knowledge of the Kingdom of God is spoken of as a mystery hidden from the many and reserved for the inner circle of believers. But Professor GARDNER does not think that that utterance is in the manner of Jesus. He regards it as probably one of the later traditions, such as are found in our early Gospels. There is a passage in the Apocalypse, however, in which the word 'mystery' occurs in a noteworthy sense. 'Then is finished the mystery of God, according to the good tidings which he declared to his servants the Prophets.' The meaning seems to be that with the

blast of the seventh angel the hidden purpose of God, which He had made known only to the prophets of the Christian Church, became evident to the world; so that the word is used in a way closely parallel to that of pagan Greece. Otherwise in the Apocalypse the word is used to denote a symbolical appearance which requires explanation by one who is initiated in its meaning, such appearances as those of the Seven Stars and of the woman seated on a scarlet beast.

Then Professor GARDNER turns to the Pauline writings. He finds himself in a new region as regards many sides of religion, but it is particularly new as regards that side of it which is turned towards the mysteries.

In the first place, it is worthy of note that St. Paul uses words and phrases which belong to the mysteries. Even if he does not use them in their special sense, the very fact of their occurring to him is important. The word 'perfect' (τέλειος) applied properly to a person fully initiated, and the word 'to be instructed' (μυεῖσθαι) meant to learn the secret imparted in the mysteries. To 'enlighten' (φωτίζειν), again, which is used in the Epistle to the Ephesians, is a word which expressed the illumination coming from the secret rites. How quickly the use of such terms was spread is shown by the occurrence in the Epistle of James, one of the least mystic books of the New Testament, of the phrase 'wheel of birth,' which belongs in origin to the Orphic mysteries.

What, then, are the mysteries of St. Paul? Generally speaking, when St. Paul speaks of mysteries he refers to something which has been specially revealed by God to those who are initiated into the faith of Christ. If he uses the word in the plural he may mean the doctrines or rites which belong to the Christian Church. He calls himself and his colleagues, treasurers or dispensers of the Divine mysteries. He speaks of charity as better than the knowledge of mysteries. And he uses the plural when he calls the speaking in tongues a speaking of mysteries, where it appears to mean that what was spoken or understood only by the speaker was his private secret, and had to be explained to hearers by an interpreter.

St. Paul mentions it as a Christian mystery that at the coming of Christ some shall arise from sleep and some shall be changed. This is a mystery, says Professor GARDNER, not in the sense of being anything hard to understand, for the notion of a spiritual body was widely accepted in Greek speculation of the time, but as a belief peculiar to Christians and the secret of their confidence in the future.

But there is one mystery which is at the very heart of Christianity. When St. Paul speaks of it he becomes reticent; he hints at the meaning rather than expresses it. It may be, says Professor GARDNER, that he finds it difficult to speak of things which call up in himself over-mastering emotions. He probably felt like Luther, who said, 'If Thou truly feelest this in thy heart, it will be so great a thing to Thee that Thou wilt rather keep silent than say aught of it.'

What was this mystery? Professor GARDNER believes that the commentators have usually been mistaken in their identification of the great Pauline mystery. Some have said that it is the Messiahship of Jesus Christ; others that it is nothing else than the inclusion of the Gentiles along with the Jews in a common hope in Christianity. Both these were no doubt parts of the great Divine plan which was given to St. Paul to disclose to the world. But these are not his pearl of great price.

Professor GARDNER examines the passages in which the Apostle speaks of this mystery of Christianity. He comes to the conclusion that to St. Paul the one profound mystery was 'the existence of a spiritual bond holding together a society in union with a spiritual Lord, with whom the society had communion, and from whom they received in

the present life safety from sin and defilement, and in the world to come life everlasting.'

Do we believe in immortality? Mr. A. C. Benson thinks we do. He has evidence of it. It is the readiness with which biographers speak evil of the dead.

The old phrase *De mortuis nil nisi bonum* is not only old but obsolete. And why? Not because we have less reverence for the dead, but because we have more. If we thought the dead were so dead that we should never meet them again, then we should say nothing but good about them; but if we believe that they are aware of what we are doing, and that we shall yet have to answer to them for the things which we now say about them, then, says Mr. Benson, we shall be careful to tell the truth and the whole truth. Well, we do tell the truth about the dead in these days. Therefore we believe in immortality.

This is Mr. Benson's introduction to a volume of biographies. After the manner of Ruskin, of whom he has recently been writing so pleasantly, he gives his book the cryptic title of *The Leaves of the Tree* (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 7s. 6d. net). It is a volume of biographies. It contains biographies of Westcott, Henry Sidgwick, J. K. Stephen, Bishop Wilkinson, Professor Newton, Myers, Lightfoot, Henry Bradshaw, Kingsley, Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, and Matthew Arnold; and in all of these biographies Mr. Benson counts the old phrase 'Nothing but good about the dead' both old and obsolete. In one instance he has been taken to task for it. The biographies were first contributed to the *Cornhill Magazine*; and when the biography of Professor Newton appeared there, his friends remonstrated. Some thought it disrespectful, and others thought only one side of him was given. Mr. Benson does not remove anything that may have been considered disrespectful, and he does not give the other side. This is the truth about Professor Newton so far as he is able to apprehend it; and so, he first defends and then repeats it.

Let us see how this argument for immortality may be carried out. Mr. Benson believes that the late Bishop Wilkinson of St. Andrews is aware of what is going on in the world to-day, aware of what Mr. Benson is saying about him in this book. For that reason Mr. Benson says this. He says: 'He was always an individualist; he thought of souls as solitary wayfarers, or as little groups of pilgrims, finding their anxious way to God—not as a mighty army marching with trumpets blowing and banners flying. A good instance of this is his strange and almost ineffective attempt to arrive at some principles of reunion in Scotland in his later days. He threw himself warmly into the reunion movement, arranged conferences, appointed days of united prayer; but when it came to taking practical steps he had nothing to give but a lyrical passion of devotion, and he sternly declined and forbade any interchange of pulpits, or any deviation from the principles of ecclesiastical organization, saying that he did not believe that any such artificial fusion would foster the cause which he had at heart.'

How much must a man believe, in order to be called a Christian? Five things, says Professor Curtis. He must have 'a genuine faith in God's Fatherhood, in Christ as the unique Son of God, and in His power to save the world, an acceptance of Holy Writ in its evident spirit, and a devotion to the Church as the Divine instrument for the promotion of the Kingdom.'

Is that too little, or is it too much? It is not likely to be too much; for the purpose of Professor Curtis, in the very place where he names those five things, is to encourage the Church to be content with little rather than demand much. Professor Curtis has published a volume on Creeds and Confessions of Faith. Its full title is *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith in*

Christendom and Beyond, with Historical Tables (T. & T. Clark; 10s. 6d. net).

The book is mainly a history, as its title tells us. It is the most complete, and it is also the most reliable, history that has been written in our day. Professor CURTIS, who has the unique distinction of having won his Chair in the University of Aberdeen by examination, and won it with a range of learning which surprised his examiners, has given himself to this work as if he meant it to be the great work of his life. First he contributed the article on 'Creeds and Confessions' to the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, and then he published the book.

But, although the book is mainly a history, Professor CURTIS is too keenly interested in that mighty movement which seems as if it would carry Creeds and Confessions away with it, to be satisfied with a history of the past. His last chapter, which is the only chapter we shall touch upon, is entitled 'Subscription and its Ethics.' It is in that chapter that he utters his plea for a larger tolerance.

It is an unusual thing to find a great authority on Creeds arguing that we should sit as easy as possible to them. Professor CURTIS's argument is the argument of a statesman. He would count it a calamity if the great Creeds of Christendom were to become a dead letter, or if the great Churches of Christendom were to adopt a constitution, no part of which began with the words 'I believe.' And he sees the danger of that. There has been no very general tendency of late to cry heretic, but that is not a sign of the times that is necessarily good. Heretics who are heretics indeed may escape the due reward of their doubts simply because the strings of the Creed have been drawn too tightly and the public mind has gone into revolt. Professor CURTIS would relieve a man from the very suspicion of heresy, a suspicion that is sometimes burdensome enough without a heresy hunt, simply by giving every man freedom in the Church to express his own individuality within the mind of Christ.

And Professor CURTIS is not without the courage of his convictions. Dare one venture, he asks, on a sketch of the ideal Creed which shall rally our shattered ranks and heal the hurt of Christ's Church? He ventures on it. For he is free to acknowledge that in spite of what the Christian world calls risks, his heart goes out increasingly to the forms of the New Testament, to the simplicity of the Apostolic age, in whose holy records the Christian spirit 'still finds its greenest pastures and its stillest waters.' It will be, he says, in the sacred words of Holy Writ alone that the Churches shall finally find the symbol of their recovered unity. And then he quotes three creeds with each of which he seems to be in sympathy, and between which he seems to see but little difference.

The first is the creed of the late Dr. John WATSON. Imagine, says Dr. WATSON, a body of Christians who should take their stand on the Sermon of Jesus and conceive their creed on His lines. Imagine how it would read: 'I believe in the Fatherhood of God; I believe in the words of Jesus; I believe in the clean heart; I believe in the service of love; I believe in the unworldly life; I believe in the Beatitudes; I promise to trust God and follow Christ, to forgive my enemies and to seek after the righteousness of God.' The second is the creed of Dr. James DENNEY. Looking back, says Dr. DENNEY, to the investigations which we have just completed, and recalling the significance which Jesus had in His own mind, and has always had in the minds of Christians, it is perhaps not too bold to suggest that the symbol of the Church's unity might be expressed thus: 'I believe in God through Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord and Saviour.' The last is the creed of the late Professor FLINT. A very short creed, says Dr. FLINT, may be much better than a long one, and quite sufficient if received intelligently and firmly. 'The Lord's

Prayer is short, but if a man thoroughly believe it —thoroughly believe in God's Fatherhood, and man's brotherhood, the sacredness of God's name, the grandeur of the claims of God's kingdom, the obligations of God's will, and our dependence on Him for the supply of our bodily wants, for pardoning mercy, and for deliverance from temptation and evil—he will not only pray aright but live aright.'

Do these three creeds contain all the five elements of a creed which at the beginning Professor CURTIS said were necessary to make a man a Christian? No doubt they do. But now Professor CURTIS is out in search of the shortest possible creed. These three are short; and yet he thinks we might be satisfied now with a shorter. He ends his discussion with this sentence: 'If to the Fisherman Apostle it was given to hold the Keys, it would be difficult for him to refuse admission to the Christians of all communions who can unreservedly profess in his own earlier or later words, "Thou art the Christ, Son of the living God," or more simply still, "Thou knowest that I love Thee."'

Spiritual Power.

BY THE REV. HERBERT A. WATSON, D.D., LANCASTER.

'That ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man.'—EPH 3^{16}.

ST. PAUL begins this statement of his appeal on behalf of the Ephesians with a reference to the Fatherhood of God, and he traces the origin of the general idea of fatherhood, divine and human, to this original Fatherhood, which is divine. It has been said that the modern presentation of the idea, or the recent revival of its presentation, can be traced to a statement made by a statesman in the House of Commons in the course of a speech.

He had heard the phrase in a sermon, and it struck him with such force that he ventured to repeat it in a secular assembly. Thence it spread through the country. Now the idea is very old and is presented to us in the opening address of our Lord's Prayer, but, if it is in any danger of becoming outworn, there is much importance in reviving it and restoring its original vividness. According to St. Paul, the idea of the Fatherhood of God lies at the root of our family life, and, instead of saying that we represent our relation to God in terms of our human relation to one another, he distinctly states that the human relation takes its name from the divine. And he proceeds to develop this thought by showing how the human nature is connected with the divine, by making his prayer that the Ephesians may be strengthened by God's Spirit into their inner man. He does not simply state the sphere in which God's influence works, but he virtually describes the passing of God's influence into man. He lays stress upon the act of influence rather than upon the fact of its presence. And thus he implies more strongly the close connexion between God and man,—something passes from God into man. God is our Father—that is one fact; His fatherly influence passes into us—that is another fact. Now we are told, on the other hand,—and this is particularly brought out by the Modernist School,—that God is transcendent, and that our appreciation of Him can only take a symbolic form. Our actual experience is completely different from divine experience, and, if we express the one in terms of the other, it is only the terms that are the same, we are only symbolizing the idea of God, or translating it into our own experience. The two ideas remain absolutely distinct, the idea of God and the idea of man.

In this sense the whole life of Christ is symbolic, just as the whole of the Catholic religion is symbolic.

The miracles present the idea of God in symbolic form, and the sacraments and forms of religion do the same. Whether the Modernist idea has pushed itself too far will have to be decided by applying the test of time, but at any rate it reminds us of a common need, the need of distinguishing the transcendent from the human. St.

Paul avoids the danger, and explains the mystery by emphatically declaring that there *is* a close connexion between God, our Father, and ourselves, His children. The connexion is established by a similarity between the divine and the human, not an actual similarity between two natures that widely differ, but at least a common ground. The common ground is expressed by the term 'spirit,' which is certainly implied by the in-breathing of God's Spirit into man, which St. Paul accepted as a true description of man's creation.

Thus the chasm between the human and the divine is actually bridged, and the terms applied to both have some possibility of being interchanged. At least we can speak of man in terms of God. But does this connect us with the divine in actual realization? It does, if it connects us with God in fact. And of the fact St. Paul has not the shadow of a doubt. For he tells the Ephesians that they are one spirit as much as one body, and he sums up the close connexion between Jews and Gentiles by deliberately stating their power of approaching God in one spirit and linking it with their reconciliation to God in one body.

Thus he assumes a unity of spirit corresponding to a bodily unity, connecting the Ephesian Church with the ancient Church of God. We are bound to understand that the term 'spirit' as applied to God and as applied to man must have the same meaning. There is a difference of degree, but not of kind. How is the idea of the spirituality of man to be reconciled with the idea of the transcendency of God? Again we come back to the original idea of the Fatherhood of God. There is no difference in kind between a father and his children, but there is a difference of degree. So far as man is man and God is God, the two are far as the Poles asunder. But God's object is to make Himself known to man, and, in order that man may have strength to realize God's greatness—St. Paul amplifies the term by stating greatness in various directions, of breadth and length and height and depth,—in order that man may have strength to recognize the love of Christ—a special manifestation of God's greatness,—he is connected with God through spirit. Spirit is the force which bridges the chasm, effects an entry into the nature of man, and establishes a sphere in which God may work. Spiritually, therefore, God is not finally unapproachable by man, so far He is not transcendent. Spiritually we can realize Him, even though we fail to grasp Him in mind and express Him in language. The connexion with God will at last be perfect, when man's realization of God passing through the idea into purpose, and from purpose into action, reaches the completeness which is God's object for him and for the world.

The prospect is far-reaching, but the sketch of human hope is not Utopian. Not only the Ephesian Church needed this idealistic prayer, but, wherever man's horizon is limited by his immediate experience, he requires the suggestion of a wider, or rather a different, horizon. The difficulty of combining worldliness with other-worldliness is so close to our experience that it hardly needs to be stated. But, when the Quakers based their objection to the current religion of their day upon the want of spiritual religion, they at any rate realized the line that improvement would have to take. If the Church of the seventeenth century needed a warning to spiritualize itself, so also the Church of to-day cannot afford to neglect the warning. We were told long ago by Ignatius that, wherever Christ is, there is the Catholic Church, and parallel with the strengthening of the spirit stands the indwelling of Christ in the human heart, according to the prayer of St. Paul. The Spirit is to penetrate the inward man, and by that act Christ is to take up His dwelling in the heart. Thus the Spirit is closely connected, intimately allied with Christ. 'I will not leave you desolate, *I* come unto you.' The Christian completeness depends upon the realization of Christ through the Spirit of God. A *man* must be joined to God in spirit, a *Christian* must exemplify the connexion by his assimilation of Christ. Just as Christ took manhood into God, so conversely man is to allow godhead to enter into man. But he may acknowledge the fact and yet fail to encourage the influence. For it is a matter of faith and of heart and of love. The faith is the means, the heart is the place, and love is the method. But his faith is not simply the belief of others, the repetition of phrases current around him, his identification with Christian thought. It is his determination to connect belief with will, to translate feeling into action, to pass from thought to practice. This he does partly by the power that is given him, put into his spirit, partly by his use of that power. Nor is the heart simply the place where a man can

be moved, it is the centre of his actions as well as of his feelings. And love is a general not an individual method, binding him to his fellows in a society whose common object it is to set forth the indwelling of Christ.

Spiritual power, then, touches a man on his three sides—his thought, his will, his feelings. It does not exercise an external influence upon his life, but it transfuses the whole of his nature. It is not outside his worldly life, but it is within it. So far from interfering with his regular work, it guides it by supplying the required motive, often unconsciously, never visibly. But the results appear, even when the process is unseen. 'The vision splendid' need not '*fade* into the light of common day,' may even illumine it with a brighter glow. In the power of the Spirit men have gone forth to their work and to their labour until the evening. They have done what ordinary men have done, but they have done it in a different way. In them the original connexion between man and God has never been broken, nay, rather has been strengthened, as life's morning freshness has glowed into noonday heat and brightened into evening glory. It has been the thread running through their life, and, though ever and again it has been strained, it has never been severed in twain. When the vision of Christ fell upon the sight of St. Paul on the way to Damascus, it seemed to break the continuity of his life. But in reality it changed formalism into spiritual fervour, and made him fully realize the human relation on its divine side. What changed the tenor of his life may influence any life to an inconceivable degree. We do not lose the identity of our nature, when we allow it to be so directed. Divine strength is breathed, through the Spirit of God, into our inward man. From this centre God inspires all our activities, and our active life gives His holy influence freer, fuller scope of action than He could have found if man had been merely a meditative, solitary being, with no work to do in life, and no companionship to produce and stimulate effort, co-operation and resultant love. In a word, we love, because He first loved us: because God, who *is* Love, has passed into our inward nature, has quickened our thought and feeling and will, by means of our environment, into a livelier energy, and has shown us that spiritual life reaches its highest development in the domain of the material life, which must always, in this world, be its exercising ground. They, in fact, who dare to lift up their work to the highest level they discern for it—it is the spiritual method that the late Bishop of Oxford has bequeathed to us—they are most sure to meet with God. For he who is truly strengthened with power through God's Spirit in the inward man is no mere idealist, but a practical exponent of the truth that religion lives and works and loves in common life.

In the Study.

New Sermon Literature.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark have published the first two volumes of the second year's issue of 'The Great Texts of the Bible' (10s. each; or in sets of four, 6s. each). One of the volumes deals with the Old Testament, and the other with the New. The Old Testament volume runs from Deuteronomy to Esther; the New completes the Epistle to the Romans.

Rev. J. M. E. Ross, M.A., of Golder's Green Presbyterian Church, London, is a topical preacher, and he is not ashamed of it. Let others take texts and expound them; he takes a text as a nail to hang his topic on. His subject once is 'The Praise of Men.' He takes two texts, 'I praise you' (1 Co 11^{2}) and 'I praise you not' (1 Co 11^{17}), and he begins in this way: 'I wish to speak of the place of *praise* in human life—the uses of praise and the dangers of praise. And having that somewhat large topic before me, I do not propose to use these texts as more than finger-posts to start me upon the way.' And all those who love to expound their texts, and believe that there is no preaching like it, will find Mr. Ross a dangerous man; his topical preaching is so attractive, it is so evangelical, it is so unexceptional. After all, he builds everything upon the Word of God. He is just as little captivated by the newspaper heading as the most strictly textual expositor among us. The title of his

book is *The Christian Standpoint* (Robert Scott; 3s. 6d. net).

The new volumes of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series were just mentioned last month, since they arrived in time for that and nothing more. They differ very greatly. Canon Hutton's volume, which is called *A Disciple's Religion* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net), is ethical and personal. Evidently he is interested in conduct, and he likes to study conduct in the life of an actual person. The first four sermons are on Simplicity, Patience, Mission, and Sacrifice; but then we come to five sermons on persons in whom such virtues as these are seen at work. Shakespeare is one of them, and that sermon on Shakespeare is worth a place in Shakespearean literature.

Dr. Woods, who calls his volume *At the Temple Church* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net), is doctrinal. Faith works itself out in love, and he likes to show it; but he tells us most about faith. He does not write on his doctrines as if he were writing a manual of theology. His sermons are short; he goes to the centre of the doctrine at once. What a striking doctrinal vision that is which goes by the title of 'Vulgarity.' The text is, 'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean.'

For the motto of his first volume of sermons, and for the title of it, Dr. Moffatt has gone to Browning. The title is *Reasons and Reasons* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.); the motto is—

'The candid incline to surmise of late
That the Christian faith may be false, I find; . . .
I still, to suppose it true, for my part,
See reasons and reasons.'[1]

The whole book is, therefore, an apologetic. Dr. Moffatt desires in every sermon he preaches to give a reason for the hope that is in him. Now we should like very much that those who have read his *Literature of the New Testament* would read his sermons also. Is there doubt about the authenticity of Ephesians? There is none about the power of the Cross.

There is no apology for Christianity in the preaching of the Rev. John Thomas, M.A.; there is no apology for Christianity or for Christ. His belief in the power of the cross is unfaltering, his belief in the redemption through Jesus Christ is untouched by modern speculation about His historicity or even about His deity. To read sermons like those he has published under the title of *The Mysteries of Grace* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.) is to live throughout the reading in a bracing atmosphere, an atmosphere that is bracing to body, soul, and spirit.

[1] Browning, 'Gold Hair,' xxix–xxx.

The successful preacher, they say, has now to be a practical preacher. Exposition is out of date, and imagination is out of place. The hearer must understand every sentence at once. He must be told what to do, and left to himself to do it or not. Such a practical preacher is the Rev. Ambrose Shepherd, D.D. He calls his new volume *Bible Studies in Living Subjects* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net), but the living subjects are more than the Bible studies.

The sermons in Professor Denney's new volume, *The Way Everlasting* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), are as characteristic of Professor Denney as sermons can ever be of the man who preaches them. It is not that they are all cast in the same mould. Dr. Denney himself is not cast in one mould. There is considerable variety in him; he has his moods and his moments like the rest of us. But he has one fundamental idea round which every other thought of his mind and every other impulse of his life gathers. That idea is the centrality of the cross of Christ. And so the cross of Christ is central in every one of these sermons, whatever their text or whatever their topic may be. There is a sermon on Missions. It was preached at the annual meeting of the Baptist Missionary Society in April 1911. In that sermon Dr. Denney tells us that he once heard a distinguished missionary say: 'Some people do not believe in missions. They have no right to believe in missions; they do not believe in Christ.' This, says Dr. Denney, goes to the root of the matter. 'It is not interest in missions that we want in our churches at this moment, but only in the Gospel. Apart from a new interest in the Gospel, a revival of evangelical faith in Christ as the Redeemer, I believe we shall look in vain for a response to the missionary appeals.'

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have also pub-

lished a new volume by the Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., B.D., entitled *The Hope of the Gospel* (6s.). There is no man for whom a reviewer can do less. For in the very first volume which Mr. Jones published he reached the highest level of effective evangelical preaching, and he does not fall below that level even in a single sermon. His best sermon is neither first nor last nor midway; every sermon is best. And this is the more surprising in that he seems to withhold so few of his sermons from publication.

The difference in language between the American and the Englishman is nowhere more glaring than in the average sermon. There are words and combinations of words in the Rev. Frederick F. Shannon's volume of sermons at which a conventional Englishman would shudder. The title of the sermon on Jn 1^{14} is 'Fleshing the Word.' And the treatment is sometimes as wonderful as the words. One sermon has two divisions—(1) 'Life's Water-pot Stage,' (2) 'Life's City Stage'; the text is 'So the woman left her water-pot, and went away into the city' (Jn 4^{28}). The title of the volume is *The Soul's Atlas* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

A volume of sermons and addresses by Archdeacon Moule has been published by Mr. Robert Scott under the title of *The Splendour of a Great Hope* (3s. 6d. net). China is the subject. At the back of every sermon, and at the front of every address, is China, its interest and its need.

Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman has published two volumes almost together. One is a volume of *Revival Sermons* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net); the other is entitled *The Personal Touch* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 2s. 6d. net). The second is also a volume of Sermons, and of Revival Sermons, but there seems to be more of the winning note in them.

How difficult does the Presbyterian minister find it to 'address the Table,' for a Table address must be everything or it is nothing. It is everything if it has the right tone: the information it offers is of no account. Professor David Smith has published ten Table addresses under the title of *The Feast of the Covenant* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). Knowing the difficulty, he has wisely introduced each address by a short poem. The poem strikes the note at once, whether it is original or the translation of a Latin hymn. The few sentences that follow, follow harmoniously, and there is a sense of Divine nearness. Not more than one address should be read at a sitting.

The Rev. Douglas Macleane, M.A., Canon of Salisbury, has picked out a sermon from the sermons of each of the greatest English preachers and has published them all together in a volume to which he has given the title *Famous Sermons by English Preachers* (Pitman; 6s. net). From Bede, who is the first, he has chosen 'An All-Hallowtide Sermon'; from Peter of Blois one on 'Satan the Accuser'; from Latimer he has taken the sermon on 'The Ploughers'; from Lancelot Andrewes the sermon 'Of the Power of the Keys'; and so on till he has come down to Mozley, from whom he has chosen the sermon on 'War,' and to Canon Liddon, from whose many volumes he has selected the well-known sermon on 'Five Minutes after Death.' Each sermon is introduced by a brief biography.

Virginibus Puerisque.

We promised to quote a sermon this month from Mr. Jerdan's new volume, *Manna for Young Pilgrims* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 5s.). There is so steady a level of excellence in the volume that the choice is difficult. But take this on

Living Dogs and Dead Lions.

'A living dog is better than a dead lion.'—Ec 9^4.

Dogs, when they are referred to in the Bible, are not mentioned in a kindly way. They are almost always spoken of with contempt. In the life of the Hebrews the dog had no place whatever as the companion of man. The writers of Holy Scripture never once refer to him as possessing bright intelligence or warm affection. The Eastern dog is a pariah animal who lives in the streets and feeds on offal. Very often he is lean and mangy. And he is an emblem of all that is idle and lazy, filthy and cowardly.

There are only two good words given to dogs in the whole Bible. The one is in the New Testament, where the Syrophœnician woman says to our Lord, 'The little dogs eat of the crumbs that fall from their masters' table.' Her words remind us of the fact that in Syria children often make pets

of puppies taken from among the pariah dogs. They keep them within the houses of their parents, as long as they are young and small; and thus the little dogs do really eat of the crumbs. Soon, however, the creatures outgrow this kindness; the little doggies become big, and must go back to live on the streets.

The only other good word spoken about the dog in the Bible is the word here: 'A living dog is better than a dead lion.' And yet there is even in this saying something like a slur upon the dog. The sentence gets its point from the universal feeling of contempt with which a dog is looked upon in the East. The words read like a proverb; the name 'dog' is used as a similitude, and so of course is the name 'lion' also. The meaning of the saying is that life in its poorest and humblest forms is always something noble. Life, says the Wise Man, has always a tremendous advantage over death.

There are at least three respects in which 'a living dog is better than a dead lion.'

I.

He is better for himself.—'There is hope' for him, says the former part of the verse. While there is life there is hope. The 'living dog' has a future before him, but the 'dead lion' has none. Every dog has his day; and life is as sweet to him, while his day lasts, as it was to the king of beasts, which is now dead. So, too, a nursery cradle, with a crowing child in it, is better than any dark, cold mausoleum which receives the dust of kings.

No potentate of the ancient world was more powerful than Rameses II., one of the Egyptian Pharaohs who lived three thousand years ago. Rameses was the oppressor of the Israelites. He was a great military leader. He built some of the most imposing of the old Egyptian temples, the monuments, and public works. The mummy of Rameses is exhibited in the museum of Ghizeh, near Cairo; and the tourist gazes with strange wonder upon the regal face of the once powerful Pharaoh. But the meanest slave in Africa would not change places with the 'dead lion.'

Richard I., the crusading king of England, who was a man of daring courage, was called even before his death 'the Lion,' or 'Cœur de Lion,' that is, 'the Lion-hearted.' He was shot by an archer while he was besieging the Castle of Chaluz, near Limoges in France, and his heart was given after his death to the city of Rouen. The dust of that 'lion-heart' is shown in a little glass case in the Rouen Museum. The visitor gazes upon it with awe, but no soldier could derive any martial inspiration from it. Its only use would be to remind him of his mortality.

'To him that is joined to all the living there is hope'; and when we read these words, we must not forget the supreme hope, the hope of eternal life. Over the gateway of Hell, in Dante's great poem, are written the dreadful words, 'All hope abandon, ye who enter here.' The most exalted of men, who die in their sins, have lost this hope for ever; but the vilest and most degraded of the living are still in 'the place of hope.' These are like the 'living dog'; and he is better for himself.

II.

He is better for others.—'A dead lion' is of no use to anybody, except perhaps for the owner to stuff his skin, and place him in a museum, to show what he was like when he was alive. But, on the other hand, 'a living dog' may be of much service while his life lasts. The Syrian street dogs perform work of the greatest value to the citizens. They are, in fact, the sanitary department of the town. They devour the refuse that is thrown into the streets, which otherwise would poison the air, and might perhaps breed a pestilence. In our own country, again, the dog is of more and larger use. We sometimes employ him to defend our homes. The shepherd's dog assists his master to manage the flock. Especially is the dog of the Western world the companion of man. Dr. John Brown said, 'I think every family should have a dog; it is like having a perpetual baby; it is the plaything and crony of the whole house. It keeps them all young.' And Sir Walter Scott has said, 'The misery of keeping a dog is his dying so soon; but, to be sure, if he lived for fifty years, *and then died*, what would become of me?'

In like manner, an ordinary living man is of much more service to others than a great man who is dead. The most eminent hero, as soon as he passes away, ceases to influence the world as a much inferior person who survives him may do. Moses, the Lawgiver, was a supremely great personality, and for forty years was the leader of Israel; but the 'dead lion' Moses, who was taken away without being permitted to enter the Promised

Land, could not do the work of the 'living dog' Joshua, who had been in his right place hitherto as Moses' servant.

King Edward I. of England, 'The Hammer of the Scottish nation,' died at Burgh-upon-Sands near Carlisle, when on his way to invade Scotland during the Scottish War of Independence. There is a tradition that before he passed away, he caused his son Edward II. to swear that as soon as he was gone he would boil his body in a cauldron until the flesh became separated from the bones; after which he would bury the flesh, but preserve the bones, and carry the latter before the English army until Scotland should be subdued. A grotesque and foolish order, indeed! The fierce old savage, Edward I., was now only a 'dead lion,' and could be of no further use. His son was weak and indolent, only a 'dog' in comparison with his father; but he was 'a living dog,' and might succeed in doing what his father's dry bones could never accomplish.

The Syrophœnician woman, to whom I have already referred, was compared by Jesus Christ to 'a living dog.' He called her a 'dog,' this being the name that was given by the Jews to all who were outside of the chosen race. The saying must have sounded chilly and harsh in her ears. But the apparent coldness of it could not quench the fire of faith and love that was burning in her heart. Her immortal answer about the dogs eating of the crumbs shows that she was indeed spiritually 'living.' What a contrast there was between her faith in Jesus and the unbelief of the Scribes and Pharisees! These men, who professed to be the leaders of the people in religious matters, were 'blind leaders of the blind.' They were 'dead lions,'—dead in trespasses and sins, and of no real use to the people. The 'living dog' was better.

III.

He is better in the sight of God.—Here we may take the 'dead lion' as standing for what is showy and pretentious and artificial; while the 'living dog' represents what is real and honest and simple. Now God has told us in His Word that, both in our lives and in our worship, His soul hates ostentation and pomp and pretence, together with all keeping up of appearances behind which there is no corresponding reality.

Although, however, God hates these things, there are many people in every age who love them. Many who are not rich, not only desire to be rich, but are determined at least to *seem* to be rich. They put on the appearance of the lion, although the creature is dead and cold. They dress extravagantly, live in handsome houses, give expensive parties, and scramble for front places in society. For the sake of this keeping up of appearances they run into debt, and as a consequence forfeit honesty, truth, peace of mind, and self-respect. Is it not far better in every way to live with contentment in one's own rank or condition, to refuse to get into debt, and to resolve not to seem anything that one is not? If we shape our life so, we may look for God's blessing upon it. 'A living dog' is more pleasing in His eyes than a 'dead lion.'

It is the same as regards our acts of worship. We remember how Jesus sat down one day opposite the chests for the Temple offering, and watched the people putting their gifts into them. Rich men came, and put in large sums out of their abundance; but these gifts were 'dead lions,' if those who gave them were thinking all the time how very liberal they were. A poor widow came and put in a farthing, which was all she possessed; that is, the whole of what she had to live on. Her gift was a 'living' one; it was an offering of the first quality, seeing that the giving of it involved much self-sacrifice on her part.

A stately church service in one of the grand old cathedrals may be one of the lions of the cathedral city; and it is often doubtless a living lion, full of true spiritual worship, and well-pleasing to God. But when at any time the service in the minster becomes a mere mechanical performance, empty of soul, and heart, and devotion, in such a case the rough singing and praying of the unlettered people in a little 'Bethel,' together with the uncultured preaching of their poorly educated lay-pastor, provided it all come from the heart, is infinitely better. The Master of assemblies will accept this, but He will turn away with loathing from the other.

The purpose for which the Church exists is the salvation of men. It has been set up to breed and to build up godly men and women. A magnificent temple, in which the music is artistic and the preaching oratorical, will yet be a dismal failure unless it can be said of it that 'this and that man was born in her.' God looks upon such a place as 'a dead lion.'

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

Incidents of the Way.

They come to the Cross, where Great-heart, upon request, discourses at length upon the imputed righteousness of Christ. This passage links on with the phrase 'Word and deed' used by Goodwill, and has evidently some deliberate purpose behind it. We may safely hazard the conjecture that Bunyan had been taken to task in his own day, as he has been by a narrow-minded minority of critics in ours, for defective or erroneous doctrine of the Cross and the way of salvation in the former Part. That this is the true explanation is practically stated by Great-heart in answer to Christiana's question about Word and deed, 'Yes, it was the belief of this that cut off these strings, that could not be cut by any other means; and it was to give him a proof of the virtue of this that he was suffered to carry his burden to the Cross.' One cannot but regret this answer. How poor it, and the dull and *doctrinaire* sermon to which it refers, are when compared with the wonderful story of the look and the loosened burden rolling into the empty grave. This sermon is fantastic theorizing, while these events were living human experience, red with the man's heart's blood.

After passing a wayside gallows, on which Simple, Sloth, and Presumption are hanging—a grim reminder of the tarred corpses which swung and creaked in every wind which blew across England in those days of savage justice, the company arrives at the Hill Difficulty. At this point two notes of contemporary history break through the allegory. On the one hand, the spring has been made muddy by the feet of some that have been there since Christian's visit—*i.e.* during the interval between 1678 and 1682. A hint of the same sort has already been given in connexion with the Slough of Despond. On the other hand, the paths by which Formalist and Hypocrisy wandered to their destruction have in the same interval been barred by chains, posts, and a ditch. These indications point to the heresies and impurities of the Ranters, of whom Bunyan everywhere speaks with much bitterness, and to the Act of Toleration, which lessened the temptation to Formality and Hypocrisy. Yet it seems that the very obstructions tempted some extremists, who paraded their formal and hypocritical views from the sheer love of them.

The Hill taxes the strength of all the pilgrims, and they sit down to rest in the Arbour. Here, again, the allegory tends to get out of hand. They partake of a meal which consists of a pomegranate, a honeycomb, and a bottle of spirits—a diet surely almost as unwholesome (except allegorically) as the stolen fruit from whose effects Matthew was suffering. The Arbour of Rest is 'a losing place' in Bunyan's estimate, and Christiana must forget her bottle of spirits there as Christian had forgotten his roll—surely a sad falling off! The spot where Christian met with Timorous and Mistrust is marked now by a stage on which these impersonations of cowardice had been burned through their tongues with a hot iron for trying to persuade Christian to turn back. The savagery of this would not appear so outrageous in an age when ears were cropped and noses slit so commonly as was done under the later Stuart kings; and the incident is one more vigorous thrust at fear by the heroic and yet sensitive dreamer.

The entrance to the Church is more terrible for the women than it was for the man. This may be simply a very natural recollection of the effect of persecution upon the weaker sex, or it may have reference to some excess of cruelty from which the Nonconformists suffered in those rapidly changing days of Charles II. That this latter explanation is the correct one seems to be hinted in the note that 'this way of late had been much unoccupied, and was almost all grown over with grass.' In any case, the lions are backed by the Giant Grim, or Bloody-man, with whom Great-heart fights until he slays him. John Bunyan always brightens up at the sight of a giant. Visitors have noted that in the Galleries of Versailles, where the upper floor is hung with portraits, and

the lower with scenes of battle in which the people of the portraits are shown in action, the interest of the crowd is all in the lower galleries. Here is another instance of the same phenomenon. Like Stevenson's old sea-dog, welcoming the topsails of a Spanish battleship, Bunyan grows vital when 'there is something immediate to be done.' The giant is a very lively creation, with his backing of the lions and swearing by them, and his hideous roaring and sprawlings. It is a curious fact, in confirmation of the late Professor James' theory that terror is usually awakened more readily by sounds than by sights, that it is the roaring rather than the appearance of the giant which frightens the women. Christiana is excited by the adventure, and, oddly enough, adopts the inappropriate language of Deborah. Great-heart in conflict with Bloody-man is a vital and inspiring figure, and he gives a fine picture of the Church Militant in those fierce days.

When they arrive at the House Beautiful we find that our old friend the Porter is now 'Mr.' Watchful, and we are introduced to a new damsel, whose name is Humble-mind, at the door. The House Beautiful is true to the symbolism of the great Gothic cathedrals, whose huge doors proclaim abundant entrance, and yet narrow down to a very lowly wicket, through which those who enter must stoop in order to gain admittance. Great-heart departs, for they had only asked for his company for a stage, and the answers to prayer are limited by the faith of the suppliant. But there is a hope, afterwards to be fulfilled, that further prayer may bring the fuller blessing. This House, when they enter it, is noisier than it was in Christian's time. Its people are still the same composite characters, in which are mingled prim conventionality and warm-hearted human nature. 'Welcome, ye vessels of the grace of God,' they cry; but they add 'Welcome unto us who are your faithful friends.' In the note that supper has been already cooked for them, 'for the Porter had heard before of their coming, and had told it to them within,' we have one of those touches which distinguish the second telling of the story from the first. This is conscious and elaborate, and could not have been written in the tale of Christian's journey. The *raconteur* is thinking now of the consistency of his narration; formerly he needed no such precaution, for the tale told itself. The dream of Mercy, however, recalls the great dreamer to his most natural and charming style; and so the book swings to and fro, between art and experience.

They stay in the House a month, and much of the time is spent in catechizing. Prudence examines each of the four boys in turn, beginning with the youngest. She questions James on the Fundamentals, Joseph on Theology in general, Samuel on Eschatology, and Matthew on Metaphysics and Biblical Criticism. The answers are, to our ears, rather desperate; and we are glad to remember the stolen apples and to remind ourselves that these precocious theologians are, after all, human boys. But in the final speech of Prudence we are refreshed by the insuppressible native wit of Bunyan. In it there is to be found a most admirable summary of the normal sources of education—a summary which may be commended to the educational theorists and experts of the present day. According to this remarkable utterance, education is derived first from the mother, then from other people, then from Nature, then from the Bible, and finally from the Church.

Two incidents of a serio-comic nature diversify the sojourn in the House Beautiful. The first is the courtship of Mercy by Mr. Brisk, a gallant who had an eye to business as well as to beauty. The name seems to have had a sinister meaning for Bunyan, and we recall that 'brisk lad,' Ignorance, who was so severely handled in Part I. Mercy comes through this little adventure with a remarkable show of common sense. But then she has had the experience of her unhappy sister Bountiful to guide her, and the touch which describes that domestic tragedy supplies one more of Bunyan's vivid *asides*, revealing a dimly seen but very living crowd of people standing in the background behind the chief actors, like James Lee in Browning's poems of *James Lee's Wife*.

The second incident is that of the sickness and cure of Matthew. This attack is indeed somewhat belated, as the trouble came of the forbidden fruit which he had eaten near the Wicket Gate. Being fruit grown in the devil's orchard, the episode fits in well with the popular superstition that all sickness is the work of the satanic agency.[1]

Dr. Skill is introduced, a family doctor of the

[1] Cf. Masson's *Three Devils*, p. 55; and Lecky's *History of Rationalism*, i. 69–71.

old school.[1] He asks about Matthew's diet, diagnoses the case, and prescribes; afterwards declining the offered fee, which he tells Christiana to pass on to the 'Master of the College of Physicians.' The first prescription is the Old Testament medicine for sin, a barbarous black draught. This, however, not proving strong enough, Bunyan, greatly daring, imitates the Latin jargon of the medical schools of his day in the pill representing the New Testament cure for such ailments, '*Ex carne et sanguine Christi*,' together with promises and salt; adding in a sidenote, 'The Latin I borrow.' The human side of the cure is 'half a quarter of a pint of the tears of repentance.' After great persuasions and entreaties Matthew is induced to take the medicine, and a cure speedily follows. Christiana is so delighted with this panacea for all sickness of the soul, that she goes on her way fortified with twelve boxes of the pills. No doubt the whole passage is true to life, but it is coarse and revolting. It reminds us rather of the comic interludes which used to be introduced into miracle plays to relieve the tedium of the protracted solemnity.[2] The Latin is borrowed not only for its amusing verisimilitude, but perhaps also to cover a suspicion of irreverence, in which it hardly succeeds. The whole piece illustrates the danger of running into undue levity to which allegory is ever prone, and which Bunyan usually avoids with extraordinary skill.

On his recovery, Matthew proceeds to turn the tables on Prudence for her former catechizing. He asks her twelve of the silliest questions on record, and receives corresponding answers. Bunyan seems at this period to be utterly obsessed by the allegorizing habit. His very far-fetched interpretation of 'The Spider' has already been solemnly endorsed by Christiana's words, 'God has made nothing in vain.' Now, everything appears to have an occult as well as an obvious significance, from the nauseous taste of medicine to the crowing of a cock. It is the system which produced such absurd results in the theology of Origen and his followers, and which has persisted among the more superstitious schools of interpretation, forcing Scripture and life alike into unreality, to the present day. The only glimmer of the light of truth that is to be found in such interpretations, is that sense of the unity of the natural and spiritual worlds which, while it has been responsible for many extravagances, alike scientific and religious, has also defended the world against both Manichæan dualism and scientific materialism, in virtue of the mysterious but splendid truth to which it has borne witness alike in ancient days and modern.

[1] It is to be remembered that Mr. John Gifford, Bunyan's Evangelist, was appointed to fill the place of Dr. Banister, Doctor of Physic, in Bedford, in Bunyan's time. He had probably learned medicine before the Wars.

[2] Cf. 'Noah,' in the *Towneley Collection*.

The Character-Portraiture.

While we miss the firm hand and the human interest in the characters already familiar, it must be allowed that the new figures show no decline in power and vivacity, and that the individuality of each is admirably sustained. Mr. Brisk and Dr. Skill are very lively creatures. The descriptions of boy-nature are also living. Only the oldest and the youngest of the four boys are drawn in any detail. Matthew, the oldest, is as yet a poor character. His greed and disobedience, and his childishness about taking the medicine, show that John Bunyan has seen some badly spoiled children among the eldest sons of his acquaintance. But the questions he asks of Prudence exhibit him as a bore; and his conduct after his recovery makes us lose all patience. 'In a little time he got up, and walked about with a staff, and would go from room to room, and talk with Prudence, Piety, and Charity of his distemper, and how he was healed.' Surely Bunyan must have been aware that there was a good deal of the old woman about this very unpleasant young man, and that he badly needed such dealing with as a public school provides, to get rid of his mawkishness. His youngest brother, James, is a much more promising child. He cries with weariness at the Hill Difficulty, and yet his pluck is evident enough. Great-heart's chaff is very good-humoured about their going on before when there is no danger in the way, but getting behind him when the lions appear. James is an old-fashioned little man, echoing the sentiments and the language of older folk, and yet with a very brave heart in that small body of his.

The mother sustains her character well. Conventional, indeed, but strong of understanding and quick of apprehension, she represents an easily recognizable type of religious woman. She asks for a sermon, but will not accept its teaching with-

out discussion. Her point of failure is prayer, for she does not ask for a guide who will go far enough with her and her company, and God treats her as He treats the strong, giving her just what she asks and nothing more. Finally, she again forgets to send a message of petition for Great-heart, and has to be reminded to do so by Joseph. Prayer is the weak point of many of the strong; and it is peculiarly true to life when this managing, self-dependent, thinking woman fails in prayer. Yet beneath the strong mind there is a very big and rich heart. She has a kind thought even for Madam Wanton at the Cross. Her appeal to Matthew when his life is in danger is impassioned, and although she is unaccountably weak in her dealing with her wayward son, yet the quality of her love will one day redeem that weakness. But the rich depths of her character are shown at their best in the splendid outburst with which she responds to the sermon on the righteousness of Christ. Great-heart checks it, and it is a pity that he does so. Nothing could illustrate better the expansive and generous effect of the Cross upon a human soul than Christiana's spontaneous and unrestrained sentences, which are indeed infinitely more appropriate to the occasion than the meticulous theology which drew them forth.

Mercy retains her charm, and reveals it by frequent new wayside touches. There is no lack of human nature in her, and indeed she has much of that natural and graceful virtue which is found in many who have not passed through such deep experiences as hers. Her heart is heavy with the thought of those she has left behind. Her dream is the dream of a sweet child. She is 'of fair countenance,' and therefore the more alluring, and she knows it quite well. The sight of the Robin appals her with the naïve horror at the cruelty of Nature, which every naturally tender heart must feel. Humility is her constant characteristic, contrasting excellently with the firm and confident spirit of Christiana. A favourite phrase of hers, 'if I may,' indicates that want of claim and that habitual self-distrust which she herself traces to the want of experience, and in virtue of which she would fain linger in the House Beautiful that she might learn from the Sisters there.

Her judgments of others are gentle, and one of the best touches in the story is her account of the visit to Christiana, in which she omits all reference to Mrs. Timorous. She can, however, be firm when occasion requires it, as Mr. Brisk finds to his cost. Nay, she can be bitterly unmerciful. Of Simple, Sloth, and Presumption she says, 'No, no, let them hang and their names rot, and their crimes live for ever against them'; and she approves, quoting Scripture warrant for it, the barbarous punishment of Timorous and Mistrust. The cruelty of seducers and the dangerous wickedness of cowards move her to a state of indignation which clears her from Shakespeare's aphorism, 'Mercy but murders, pardoning those that kill.'

Great-heart will improve as we know him better, but already he is worthy of his name. The Interpreter's 'man-servant,' he is from the first both man and minister of religion. He will not eat with them, however, for as yet 'Never dares the man put off the prophet.' He is there in general to keep them from taking too soft and good-humoured a view of things, an austere guide who is ever ready for discourse. But when it comes to fighting, the man is transformed, and we see in him one of the long line of soldier-saints whom Robert Browning so delights in. It is a long march from the Knights Templars to the Army of the Congregation, but the same stuff is in both, and in many an heroic spirit still in the service of the Interpreter. We take leave of him in an act of absolute and unreasoning obedience on his part. He will not go forward, even to successful and congenial work, without express orders. He returns to the House of the Interpreter.

Ethical and Theological.

Great-heart's sermon, with its mechanical and complicated distinctions between the four different kinds of righteousness possessed by Christ, is as ingenious as his application to the subject of Christ's very simple and non-theological injunction about him that hath 'two coats.' The whole spirit of the sermon is mathematical and apart from any possible experience; hence its inevitable air of unreality. The passage in *Grace Abounding*, in which Bunyan deals with the same subject from the standpoint of his own experience,—when this sentence falls upon his soul, 'Thy righteousness is in heaven,' etc.,—should be read along with this. The difference between the two is the difference between death and life.

The gloom of Judgment Day hangs over the

dream here, and that is the thought suggested even by the crowing of a cock. Yet Joseph's answer to the question as to God's design in saving poor man, is happy,—'The glorifying of his name, of his grace and justice, etc., and the everlasting happiness of his creature.' That is like the answer to the first question of the Shorter Catechism, whose sunny belief in joy so fascinated the bright heart of Robert Louis Stevenson.

But the most striking theology of all is in the short description of the bath in the open air of the Garden. It is not, indeed, artistically equal to Bunyan's finest work, for this is a case in which the spiritual meaning breaks through the outward form of the allegory at considerable risk of grotesqueness. But, as an analysis of sanctification, the passage is memorable. The bath is in the open air—in contrast to all occult and secret initiations. Again, it strengthens their limbs, with that tenfold strength of the pure which at once recalls Galahad. The seal on the brow (contrary, it must be confessed, to all probabilities) beautifies them—just as their countenances, radiant with the new look of the holy, attracted the wonder and admiration of the world to the Early Christians.[1] Finally, the test of holiness is that one sees not one's own white garments, but those of others.

The moral teaching of the passage is abundant and various, but its great lesson is the need for strenuousness, and the dangers which beset those who choose a slack or easy life. There is deep and far-reaching significance in the catalogue of the victims of Simple, Sloth, and Presumption—Slow-pace, Short-wind, No-heart, Linger-after-lust, Sleepy-head, and that immortal inspiration, 'a young woman, her name was Dull.' Nothing could be better than that, as an account of the kind of people who are tempted to fail in strenuousness. Their views of God and man, and of every detail of the nobler life, grow morbid and distorted, and they fail of all high destiny because, like the avoiders of the Hill Difficulty, 'they are idle; they refuse to take pains.' It is a picture of all that lamentable company of weak brethren who might have so easily been strong, but for the temptation that lured them into luxurious self-indulgence.

[1] Cf. the memorable words in which Pater describes 'Divine Service' in his *Marius the Epicurean*, chapter xi.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM CXXXIX. 7.

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'

THE 139th Psalm is doubtless, like several of those near it, one of those written during the Captivity. It was then probably that for the first time the Jews learned fully the sense of God's omnipresence here expressed. That captivity produced many remarkable effects upon them: it modified their spoken language; it exterminated their taste for idolatry, and common sorrow deepened their patriotic feelings; above all, it brought into greater clearness some doctrinal ideas, such as the immortality of the soul, the influence of angels, and eminently the omnipresence of God. It was when the Jews were taken out of their own land, and were separated from the national temple, that they first really felt that God could be worshipped elsewhere than at Jerusalem—in synagogue as well as in temple, in the closet as well as in the sanctuary; that His ear was open to the mutterings of prayer from the exiles in a strange land; that travel where they might they were still present to Him, and He present to them. It was then that for the first time they felt God's exceeding nearness in every spot, and yet realized His vastness: 'If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.'

Ages have passed away, and the progress of time has afforded us abounding proofs of the Almighty's greatness which were not revealed to this pious Psalmist; but no nobler words have ever been used to express the vivid conception of God's omnipresence. Geography opening up the undiscovered parts of the globe and presenting

to us God's vastness stamped in the breadth of the steppe or the majesty of the mountain slope; or Imagination travelling from star to star till calculation seems unable to accompany it as it unwittingly hardly halts at the frontier of the visible creation; or History mapping out the stream of time, and testifying as it traces it backward to its unknown source and to the Voice, 'Before Abraham was, I am'; or Reason exposing link above link in the chain of causation, till it passes to a power which is certainly not mechanical and expires in faith—each of these has impressed us with the idea of God's omnipresence in a way not known to Hebrews of old. Yet though they may deepen our knowledge, they cannot elevate our piety beyond that of the Psalmist, or bring home to us more intensely the practical feeling of God's great nearness.

The most pathetic pages in the *Life of Andrew Fuller* relate to the great man's prodigal son, Robert. To the unspeakable grief of his father, Robert ran away to sea, and died off Lisbon in 1809. In a sermon preached on the Lord's Day after the receipt of the news, his father seemed to take great comfort from the fact that the gospel answers to the promised mercy in Dt 4^{29}: 'If *from thence* thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him.' 'Some,' he said, 'are far from home, and have no friend in their dying moments to speak a word of comfort, but He is near. When Jonah was compassed about by the floods, when the billows and the waves passed over him, he prayed to the Lord, and the Lord heard him.' Here Mr. Fuller gave vent to his feelings, and many who knew the cause wept with him. Later and fuller intelligence proved that the father was speaking almost prophetically, for during his last days Robert was known to all his shipmates as a sincere and devout Christian man.

The subject of the text is God's omnipresence. We may consider it (1) in reference to Nature, and (2) in reference to Man.

I.

The Omnipresence of God in Nature.

The thought to which the Psalmist gives expression in these magnificent words has become a commonplace of modern theology. 'Where is God?' asks the child, and we answer, half automatically, 'God is everywhere.' In the development of the Jewish religion this conception of God's omnipresence, reached only at a comparatively late period, was for long crossed and obscured by other simpler and more childish notions. To the moral attributes of Deity, to His supreme pity and justice, there are endless references in the Psalter and the Prophets; to the Divine omnipresence there are but few. And, indeed, there is an element of philosophy and of mysticism in this conception, to neither of which the native Hebrew mind was pre-eminently prone.

It has been left to our nineteenth century, which had listened to Coleridge and Wordsworth, to enter deeply into the idea of the Psalmist, 'Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there: if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand guide me.' The very discoveries of science that were supposed to be going to annihilate divinity have only served to make us more conscious of God's presence. Men who endeavoured in former times, as St. Augustine did, to conceive of God, 'Life of their life as vast through infinite space,' find Him now as revealed in the infinitesimal space also, omnipresent, with His spirit and power in the immeasurably little, as well as the infinitely vast. The evolutionist more than most seems to have served the world in this direction; and all the correlations of forces, and the study of history, the comparison of thoughts and ideas of man and his surroundings, the linking on of present to the past in all departments of knowledge, instead of banishing God from us, seems more and more to set Him in our midst, and make us feel that God's hand has led the nation, and that His right hand has upheld the progress of the world.

1. Now, first of all, those of us who desire to fashion such an idea of God as may not be hindered or harmed by that small modicum of science which we are now unable to avoid, even if we wished, will find in this doctrine of God's universality much comfort and support. It has become increasingly difficult for any grown man or woman to think of God as an almighty Monarch, ruling the world as from without. We are aware that this, the child's conception of Him, does violence both to His spirituality and to His infinitude. If He is without the world, He is bounded by the world, and is limited by space; if, again, He is so limited, He is not a spirit, for a spirit transcends the limitation of space. God is the boundless Here, as He is also the everlasting Now.

2. Again, God's omnipresence may give us the key to that puzzle concerning His relation to the so-called laws of Nature, which has sorely exercised many simple but truly pious minds. Science tells us that these laws are changeless and inflexible: the rain and the drought of to-day depend upon the drought or rain of a million yesterdays, and both condition the physical character of to-morrow. But a simple trust in God's omnipotence as constantly rebels against these assertions: religion and science seem opposed. Now, if we would but more habitually remember that the laws of nature, whether of the rain or wind or human health and disease, are God's laws, that they are in no profane or unreal sense part of Himself, the expression of His will and of His being, we should at once see that they are obviously changeless and eternal even as He. To ask God to change them means to ask God to change Himself, to make the rational irrational, the immutable reality a varying and deceptive chimera.

3. It is the conception of God's immanence, of His Spirit as operative in nature as well as in man, which has constituted the meaning and worth of nature, as the living raiment of Deity, to many a philosopher and poet. It is this conception which, for example, underlies that famous passage in Wordsworth, where he says:

I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts: a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
A notion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thoughts,
And rolls through all things.

4. The relation of God to the external world is not only made more intelligible upon this hypothesis, but nature herself, so regarded, assumes an aspect more beautiful and more divine. This is what Goethe felt in the oft-quoted lines:

Were *He* a God who working from without,
His hand extended, turns the world about?
No! from within must He that world control,
Nature in Him, Himself all nature's soul,
So that what in Him moves and breathes and lives,
May never lack the power His spirit gives.

Has it not happened to us, over and over again, to say, 'Spring, or summer, was never so beautiful before'? This is true every year to the recipient soul. Not that there is any added physical charm or visible glory; but it is the Spirit of our Father that glows and beams upon us, that pours itself into our souls; and if we have grown by His nurture, there is in us more and more of spiritual life that can be irradiated, gladdened, lifted in praise and love, with every recurring phase of the outward world.[1]

Dr. Pope in his Tamil Grammar tells a story of the Tamil poetess Auveiyar.

'The traditions current among the Tamil people regarding "the wonderful old woman" are very numerous. She was one day sitting in the porch of a temple with her feet stretched out straight before her—not considered to be a very respectful position in the presence of a superior. The officiating priest rushed out to her with the question, "Are you not ashamed to stretch out your feet in the presence of the Swami?" To which she replied, "Very true, sir! if you will show me where the Swami (Lord) is *not*, I will go and stretch out my feet there."'[2]

II.

The Presence in Man.

God is nearer to us than in the world around us. 'In him we live, and move, and have our being.' When I reflect on the mysteries of my own being, on the complex organism, not one of whose numberless members or processes can be deranged without suffering or peril; when I consider my own confessed powerlessness as to the greater part of this earthly tabernacle in which I dwell, and the narrow limits of my seeming power as to the part of it which I can control; when I see the gates and pitfalls of death by and over which I am daily led in safety; when I resign all charge of myself every night, and no earthly watch is kept over my unconscious repose,—I know that omnipotence alone can be my keeper, that the unslumbering Shepherd guides my waking and guards my sleeping hours, that His life feeds mine, courses in my veins, renews my wasting strength, rolls back the death-shadows as day by day they gather over me. Equally, in the exercise of thought and emotion, must I own His presence and providence. He helps me to think. He makes me feel. He energizes my will. He holds open for me the record of memory. He kindles my hope. My soul lives only as it is bathed in the ocean of His life. Be it mine, then, so to live, that it shall be my joy to find in the whole realm of things that

[1] A. P. Peabody.
[2] Pope, *Tamil Handbook*, 176.

are or shall be no answer to the question, 'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?'

1. The religious aspiration of man seems to express itself in the desire to draw, as we say, nearer to God. Or, again, it is expressed by the desire to become, as we say, like God. What is the link of connexion between man and God? How does man draw near to Him? If God were far off locally, if He ruled the world from without, it would indeed seem as if there could be no bridge built between the creature and his God. But when God is conceived as omnipresent and immaterial Spirit, the infinite and yet self-conscious Spirit of Reason and Love, there seems to be at once a possible connexion between Him and any other self-conscious nature which is, in however feeble a degree, both rational and good. The more wisdom and goodness you have, the more you know of God, whether you profess belief in Him or not. And, above all, Love is known of love, and the secret of God, so far as man may learn it, is with those who love Him.

To the soul of man, bathed in this omnipresence, receiving all thought and knowledge through its mediation; living, moving, and having its being in it, what can be more easily conceivable than that there should also be conveyed to it thoughts, impressions, intimations, that flow directly from the Father of our spirits? There is much in our experience in nature that seems so spiritlike as to take away all antecedent improbability as to this influence. The telegraphic wire but avails itself of currents of force that sweep over land and sea, and it is they, not our mechanism, that really connect distant countries, that write here the message which has, it may be, outsped time, and is received hours before it started on the other side of the Atlantic. It is these currents, not the wires, brought into relation with the telephone, that waft the song or symphony from city to city. Before these wires were stretched, who knows in how many instances —some, at least, have left authentic record— sensitive brains and recipient souls have been moved from afar, and brought into momentary connexion with those on whom, perhaps, the bodily eye would never rest again? How know we that it is only between man and man that these currents pass? Comes not on them the voice of God to the soul? Bear they not His monitions of duty, His warnings against evil, His thoughts of peace?

Who of us is there that has not had thoughts borne in upon him which he could not trace to any association or influence on his own plane, seedling thoughts, perhaps, which have yielded harvest for the angel reapers, strength equal to the day in the conflict with temptation, comfort in sorrow, visions of heaven lifted for the moment above the horizon like a mirage in the desert? These experiences have been multiplied in proportion to our receptivity. As the message on the wires is lost if there be none to watch or listen at the terminus, so at the terminus of the spirit-wire there must be the listening soul, the inward voice, 'Speak, Lord, for thy servant heareth.'[1]

2. But then if God is everywhere, is He *equally* near to all? If, in the physical world, we were bound to admit that God was in the raging storm as well as in the fertilizing sunshine, must we, in the moral world, say that He is equally near to the sinner and to the saint? We may observe that in the moral world, far less than in the physical world, do conceptions of space and time apply to God. He whose life exhibits less goodness has less of God than he whose life exhibits more. But nevertheless we do assert that the presence of reason is never, and can never be, wholly divorced from the presence of goodness, and that, therefore, in every rational being there is, just because God is omnipresent, the potentiality of a higher life.

But yet though we conceive that in one sense God is near to us in our frailty and sin, because love is compassionate and wise, and desires the salvation of all, and because, too, we have the power through God's Holy Spirit to repent and to return, nevertheless we are aware that the wilful obscuration of reason, which is sin, makes us far from God, though He (strange antinomy!) be not far from us. As the most essential attribute of God is goodness, so is moral evil that which prevents us from realizing the Omnipresent God. Hence this doctrine of omnipresence serves to magnify and accentuate the unnaturalness and horror of sin. To him who could fully realize the fact that he was living in God's presence, it would be almost impossible to do anything which would sully the clearness of that perception, or would loosen the bond which consciously unites him to God. 'Make us realize Thy presence' is therefore the most fundamental of human prayers; and though the Divine omnipresence remains in one sense a constant factor, we shall never cease to echo the aspiring cry of the Psalmist: 'Cast me

[1] A. P. Peabody.

not away from thy presence, take not thy Holy Spirit from me.'

In telling the story of how he was led to believe in Christ, the late Dhanjebhai Nauroji laid much stress on a conversation he once had with a fellow-Parsee, a woman who had fallen low in sin. Dhanjebhai, then a lad of about fifteen, was going one morning to the mission school, when he found this woman sitting by the roadside, weeping bitterly. He stopped to ask what was the matter, never having seen any one in so great distress. 'I have been such a wicked woman,' she sobbed, 'and I am so afraid of God. He will find me, and punish me.' 'I will tell you what to do,' said the boy. 'In our courtyard there is a deep well. Fling yourself in there, and God will never see you.' 'That would not hide me from His sight,' she replied. 'Well,' he continued, 'go out in a boat into the bay, tie a large stone round your neck, and throw yourself into the deep sea. There God will never find you.' 'He would find me even in the depths of the sea,' she said, and continued to weep and lament. The boy, terrified at seeing such despair, fled away to the school, haunted by the thought of the all-seeing eye. The Bible lesson that day, dwelling specially on the words, 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?' went home to his heart and conscience, and before long he professed his faith in Christ, and learned to rejoice in the thought of an ever-present God.

3. God is everywhere: there is therefore no violent separation to be made between the natural and the spiritual. It is *in* the so-called natural that the spiritual must be revealed. So it is not only one day in seven which should or need be dedicated to God, but all days; not one place only, which may be sanctified by His presence, but every place. Not merely in the synagogue, or the church, but in the home, and the school, and the Parliament, yes, and in the workshop, the manufactory, and the mart, is that abiding presence, which can be realized by that which is akin to it, realized by reason, and realized by goodness, but realized only because it is *there*. For if God were not with us everywhere, we could be neither rational nor good. He is the spiritual atmosphere which conditions our spiritual life. And where God is, nothing is wholly trivial or vain. Everywhere, and in all circumstances, we can seek to find out and to follow after His nature and His will, for under all seasons and conditions, God's law, which is the revelation of Himself, the law of reason and the law of love, remains immutably the same. God is the basis, and God is the goal.

The Hebrews had not even learned the poor distinction which we may yet have to unlearn between the natural and the supernatural. The thunder, the rainbow, the blossoming, and the harvest were to them no less divine than the burning bush on Horeb, or the voice from the cloud-wrapt summit of Sinai. Mystery enclosed them on every side. The realm of the unknown began at their fingers' ends—nay, it came close up to their inmost souls; for of nothing knew they less than of the contents and laws of their own being. All that they could say was, 'I am fearfully and wonderfully made.' Nor could they conceive of a pulse-beat except as a throbbing of the Infinite Fountain of life.

4. Once more, the doctrine and conviction of God's omnipresence seem to give a better meaning to suffering and sorrow and pain. If, in the words of our text, we cannot escape from God's Spirit, it is also true that we cannot escape from His love. The one is as universal as the other, because the second is the manifestation of the first. Believing in God, we are led on to trust in His goodness, though appearances may belie it. Suffering and sorrow are means to an end (though the end will never be understood, for only God can know the fulness of His own will); nay more, they are *His* means, and through that one word their horror is lessened, and their poignancy assuaged.

Suffering is educational rather than punitive, and even in the midst of it we are not deserted of God. 'If I make Hades my bed, thou art there;' there is no darkness so thick that the Spirit of God cannot penetrate it, no misery which cannot be borne if it lead us nearer to Him.

Is it not a mere fact that for many ages there have lived and died men and women who, by the purity of their lives and souls, have been able to see in suffering not the vindictiveness but the goodness of God—men and women who would freely and soberly confess that it was the very sharpness of their trouble which had brought them closer and closer to God. When sorrow, as we say, does not soften, when it does not reveal God but obscures Him, or when suffering means degradation and sin and ignorance and undeserved defilement, then, indeed, we are tempted to murmur; then, indeed, we need all the faith which we can muster; all our certainty of human love to make us cling yet closer to its Divine original; but while the ordinary human suffering, through which we *can* become better if we do but choose, while only this suffering befalls us, it were unworthy of the best traditions of our humanity if we quailed before the blow. 'If Hades be my bed, yet Thou art there.'[1]

5. The doctrine of the omnipresence serves, moreover, another purpose still. The God of childhood, the external God who has His dwelling in heaven, is bound to rule the world upon the lines of a benevolent Monarch, that is, externally.

[1] C. G. Montefiore.

He distributes reward and punishment, and these allotments of praise and blame are external to, and separate from, the actions or dispositions which were their cause. But the Omnipresent God cannot be conceived as rewarding or punishing externally. His rewards and punishments are internal, that is, they are the necessary concomitants and issues of the action and the character of man. If to draw near to God is man's true happiness, and to be withdrawn from Him is man's true misery, then we have here an ultimate or supreme standard by which to measure the true worth and glory of our lives.

I fled Him, down the nights and down the days;
I fled Him, down the arches of the years;
I fled Him, down the labyrinthine ways
Of my own mind; and in the midst of tears
I hid from Him, and under running laughter
Up vistaed hopes, I sped;
And shot, precipitated
Adown Titanic glooms of chasmèd fears,
From these strong Feet that followed, followed after,
But with unhurrying chase,
And unperturbèd pace,
Deliberate speed, majestic instancy,
They beat—and a Voice beat
More instant than the Feet—
'All things betray thee, who betrayest Me.'[1]

6. If this dogma of God's omnipresence may enable us to live more worthily, calling out our full capacities, meagre though they be, of hope, of faith, and of love, will it not also enable us, when the need has come, to die worthily, too? For death itself cannot separate either ourselves or those we love from God: He has given, He has taken, blessed be the name of the Lord! For, though flesh waste away, God is still our portion and their portion; and if His love and His wisdom are manifested in life, they must also be manifested, whatever and however may be the outcome, in that passage and change which we speak of as death. Those we have honoured and loved must die, perchance in the spring-time of their youth, perchance in the fulness of their age; an instant more, an instant less, in God's sight it makes no difference. They pass, but they are with Him, even as we: nay, perhaps, we may say more truly, both of them and of ourselves: They are with God, where we, too, soon shall be.

[1] Francis Thompson, *The Hound of Heaven*.

The Chinese have a fairy tale about a stone monkey who was chosen king of the monkeys, and, having learned to jump many miles at a single jump, aspired to become Lord of the Sky. The Lord Buddha said to him, 'Come outside of the palace with me, and stand upon my hand. Then if you can jump out of my hand you shall be Lord of the Sky, but if not you shall be sent down to earth and never be allowed to come up to the sky any more.' The monkey jumped, and in a moment was far away out of sight. On he went in his jump until he came to the end of the earth. There he saw five great red pillars standing on the very edge, with nothing but empty space beyond. On one of them he scratched a mark to show how far he had jumped. Then he took another big jump, and in the twinkling of an eye was back again in the Lord Buddha's hand. 'When are you going to begin to jump?' the Lord Buddha asked. 'Why, I have jumped,' said the monkey, 'jumped to the very end of the earth. If you want to know how far I have been you have only to get on my back, and I'll take you there to see.' 'Look at this, monkey,' the Lord Buddha said, holding out his hand. On one of the fingers there was the very mark which the monkey had made on the red pillar. 'You see,' said the Lord Buddha, 'the whole world lies in my hand. You could never have jumped out of it. When you jumped, and thought you were out of sight, my hand was under you all the time. No one, not even a stone monkey, can ever get beyond my reach. Now go down to earth, and learn to keep in your proper place.'[1]

O God, within my breast,
Almighty, ever-present Deity!
Life—that in me has rest,
As I—undying Life—have power in Thee!

With wide-embracing love
Thy Spirit animates eternal years,
Pervades and broods above,
Changes, sustains, dissolves, creates and rears.

Though earth and man were gone,
And suns and universes cease to be,
And thou wert left alone,
Every existence would exist in Thee.

There is not room for Death,
Nor atom that his might could render void:
Thou—Thou art Being and Breath,
And what Thou art may never be destroyed.[2]

[1] H. A. Giles, *Chinese Fairy Tales Told in English*.
[2] Emily Brontë.

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

Chapter vi.

1. We here have another extract from what may be termed the Book of Origins, of which Gn 1 forms the introduction. In 4^{26} the beginning of Yahweh-worship is described, in 6^{1} of the tribe and nation, in 9^{20} of agriculture, and in 10^{10} of sovereignty. The Assyrian equivalent of the Hebrew phrase would be *enuma*, so that the Book of Origins would answer to the Babylonian work entitled 'Enuma.' The Babylonian legend of the King of Kutha similarly describes the origin of the tribe and nation, which belonged, however, not, like the antediluvian race of Genesis, to the present creation, but to the imperfect creation by Tiamât and the powers of anarchy which had preceded the creation by the gods of light and order. Hence this creation was not 'on the face of the ground,' but 'in the ground' (*ina qaqqar*), and it was 'within the mountain' that the warriors 'increased and became heroes and multiplied in number' (*ina kirib sadî irtibu-ma itedlu-ma irtasû minati*).

Here, as before, the *adâmâh* would be the soil of Babylonia where man was created. The original would have been: *Enuma amelûti ana eli qaqqara irtibu-ma binâtu ti'aldu ana-sunu* (or *binâti aldu sunu*, as in *W.A.I.* iv. 1, v. 7). It is assumed that (as in $4^{1.2}$) the first-born were sons; daughters came later.

2. 'And the sons of the gods saw the daughters of mankind that they were good, and they took them wives of whomever they chose,' in Assyrian: *marê ilâni binât adami* (*amelûti*) *imuru kî dhâbat sinâti, û ekhuzu assâti ana sasunu istu kali sa irâmu.* (*Ana sasunu* belongs to the language of the Tel el-Amarna tablets; it would hardly be used in classical Assyrian.) In the religious hymns of Babylonia the worshipper is often called 'the son of his god,' an expression which originated in the belief that the gods were in the likeness of men, and so, conversely, men were in the likeness of the gods. The sovereigns of Semitic Babylonia were themselves gods, and the kings of the West Semitic dynasty of Khammu-rabi, more especially, assume the divine title, like the kings of the dynasty of Ur before them. So in the Tel el-Amarna tablets the Egyptian king is called 'god,' the plural 'gods' being used instead of the singular, like *Elohim* in the O.T., though only a single individual is meant. In assuming the title of 'god,' the Babylonian kings followed the precedent of the old heroes of Babylonian legend, all of whom were divine, though in some instances neither the father nor the mother seems to have been a deity. This, at least, appears to have been the case with Utu-napistim; in the case of Gilgames, the mother was a goddess. The actual 'sons' of the gods were the inferior deities, of whom there were several hundreds, who constituted the families of the divine hierarchy, and whose names are enumerated in the mythological tablets. These clustered more especially round the great sanctuaries, where they were served by women, with whom they were supposed to cohabit. Thus the Epic of Gilgames (vi. 184–185) enumerates the three classes of religious prostitutes (*kizirêti*, *samkhati*, and *kharimâti*) who served the great sanctuary at Erech; and, according to Herodotus (i. 181, 182), Bel Merodach, at Babylon, took to wife 'a woman whom he chose out of all the natives of the country.' This latter expression, which Herodotus states he quoted from 'the Chaldæans,' is identical with the phrase used in Genesis (τὴν ἂν ὁ θεὸς ἕληται ἐκ πασέων, ὡς λέγουσι οἱ Χαλδαῖοι; נָשִׁים מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר בָּחָרוּ). The technical Babylonian term was *râmu*, of which the Greek and the Hebrew (αἱρεῖν and בחר) are alike translations. The belief in the cohabitation of the sons of the gods with the hierodules of the temples (which does not appear to have been applicable to the father-gods Anu, Ellil, and Ea) survived the decay of Babylonian civilization in folklore. In the Book of Tobit, Asmodeus similarly cohabited with Sara, the daughter of Raguel; and the Mendaite Book of Adam describes the Hengê as demons 'who throw themselves upon the daughters of men.'

After selecting the hierodules, the sons of the

gods would have 'gone'—φοιτᾶν is the word used by Herodotus—to the temple and reclined with the women upon the nuptial couch, which stood in the inner shrine of the Babylonian sanctuary. It is clear, therefore, that v.^{4b} should follow v.^{2}, vv.$^{3.4a}$ being interpolations. The passage ought to run: 'They took them wives of whomsoever they chose; and then after this (it happened) that the sons of the gods went to the daughters of mankind, and they begat for themselves the heroes which were of old, men with names.' The Assyrian would be: *u arki annu marê ilâni ana binât amelûti itbû-ma yulidu ana sasunu qarradi, sa ultu yumê ullûti suma iskunú-sunusi*; or perhaps better: *arki sa marê ilâni ana binât amelûti itbuni-ma*, 'after the sons of the gods had gone to the daughters of mankind, they begat,' etc.

The *qarradi*, or 'heroes' (of which the Heb. *gibborîm* is a translation), were the subjects of the Epic poems of Babylonia. They were all semi-divine, though some of them were not actually the sons of the gods. Among them were Etana and Gir, the first who had kingdoms, and who therefore correspond with the Biblical Nimrod, the *gibbôr-ṣaîd*, or 'hero-huntsman,' and who in the Epic of Gilgames (vii. 38) are described as 'wearers of crowns who of old (*sa ultu yumê pani*) ruled the earth.' Gilgames himself is described in the Epic as 'two-thirds divine and one-third human,' 'his body being the flesh of the gods.'

The West Semitic (or rather Israelitish) equivalent of the Bab. *qarradi* were the Nephîlîm. In Assyrian this would be *napîli*, but *napîli* signifies 'the destroyers' (literally 'tearers-out'); while *nephîlîm* is shown by Nu 13$^{32.33}$, where the spies apply the old folk-lore word to the Anakim, to have meant 'giants.' Hence the Assyrian and Hebrew words probably have no connexion with one another. That the Babylonian heroes, however, were regarded as of gigantic size, like their Greek representatives, we may gather from a fragment of Berossus relating to the war of the three brothers, Kronos (Bel), Titan (? Etana), and Prometheus. The discovery of the huge fossil bones of extinct mammalia led to a general belief in the ancient world that the earliest men were giants, and the Arabic legend of the gigantic sons of 'Ad may go back to a remote antiquity. At all events, the Israelites shared the belief, and the existence of men taller than themselves at Hebron and in the Philistine cities made them at once conclude that they were the descendants of the primitive race of giants. As a matter of fact, Mr. MacAlister's excavations at Gezer have shown that the neolithic population of Palestine was of shorter stature than the Semitic population of the bronze age which followed it, the height of neolithic man ranging from 5 ft. to 5 ft. 7 in., while that of his successor averaged from 5 ft. 7 in. to 6 ft.

It was thus natural that a Hebrew writer should add a note upon the *qarradi*, or *gibborîm*, identifying them with the *nephîlîm* of his countrymen. Hence the marginal note, 'The *nephîlîm* were in the land in those days,' which has made its way into the text, like the similar marginal note in 12^{6}. But, like the note in 10^{14}, it has been misplaced, being inserted before, instead of after, the passage to which it belongs. It would therefore seem to be of Hebrew origin, and not to be due to the translator of a cuneiform document. On the other hand, it goes back literally into Assyrian: *ina yume-suma* (*napîli*) *ina mati ibsu*, and so could be derived from a Hebrew scribe who wrote in cuneiform.

At any rate, the misplacement of the note appears to be the cause of the misplacement of the verse which precedes it, which not only interrupts the context, but has nothing to do with the origin of the heroes. V.^{3} reads, 'And Yahweh said: My breath shall not dwell in man (Adam) for ever, since he indeed is flesh, and his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.' The reading of the Septuagint, ידור instead of ידן, must be adopted here, since it is impossible to find an etymology for יָדוֹן, *yâdôn*, which would yield any sense. As the passage takes us back to chaps. 2 and 3, it is probable that the Septuagint is also right in reading 'Lord God' (Yahweh-Elohim) for 'Yahweh.' Ewald[1] first pointed out that 120 years are two Babylonian sosses of 60 years, the normal age of man being divided into the two halves of youth and age, and that consequently the passage must be of Babylonian origin. That the Babylonians actually regarded 120 years as man's normal age, we learn from Pliny (*H.N.* vii. 50) and Censorinus (*De Die Nat.* xvii. 4); and when Berossus is stated to have reckoned it at between 116 and 117 years, this merely means that 120 lunar years represent 116⅔ solar years. In Egypt, on the contrary, where the Babylonian sexagesimal system was not

[1] *Geschichte d. Volkes Israel*, i. 367 (2nd ed.).

in use, the normal age of man was reckoned at 110 years.

The original of the Hebrew translation would have been: *Sâru-ya ina amelûti lâ ittusib ana darâti, assu-sa sutu-ma bisru, û yumê-su* CXX *sanâti ibassu*, where *darâti* (from דור), the Babylonian equivalent of עֹלָם, may have led to the choice of יָדוֹר on the part of the translator. בְּ־שׁ, 'since,' is an Assyrianism, intended to render *assu-sa*.

Man became a 'living soul' through the 'breath' of Yahweh-Elohim (2[7]); since this breath was divine, and consequently immortal, man was immortal so long as it remained in him. But he was also 'flesh,' which decayed and perished; hence the decree was issued that God's breath should not remain in him 'for ever,' and that his age should be reduced to the normal two sosses of years. More than one of the Babylonian Epics was intended to provide an answer to the question why man, who was made in the image of the gods, was nevertheless not immortal. The story of Adamu, the first man, illustrates one of these attempts; the story of Gilgames and his vain search for immortality illustrates another.[1] The heroes, indeed, who were semi-divine, lived long lives, which were counted, not by sosses, but by *sari* and *ners*; but they, too, died at last. And the ordinary man could claim at most his two sosses of years. In Gn 6[3] we have a fragment of an Epic which explained why this should be so.

It would seem natural that the fragment should belong to the history of the first man, and either follow 3[22] or be derived from a parallel story. But neither in Babylonian legend nor in the O.T. does it harmonize with the ages assigned, not only to the antediluvian patriarchs, but to the post-diluvian patriarchs as well. Moses is the first who dies at the normal age of 120 years, while the first two post-diluvian kings of Babylonia are made to reign 2400 and 2700 years. The O.T. patriarchs and the Babylonian kings, however, alike belong to the class of heroes; they are not ordinary men. Hence the fragment ought to have followed the account of the heroes; its present position appears to be due to its having been attached as a note to the statement that 'men began to multiply,' and it may then have followed the marginal gloss about the Nephîlîm in creeping into the wrong place.

[1] See my *Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, pp. 425, 447.

In the Tel el-Amarna tablets the vivifying 'breath' of Yahweh is replaced by that of the Egyptian king who, being the *ilâni* or 'Elohim' of the writers, took for them the place of the Hebrew God. Thus Abimilki of Tyre, who calls the Pharaoh 'my gods' and 'the breath of my life' (*sari napisti-ya*), says in one passage (Knudtzon, 149. 21–26): *mannu baladh amel-sêpi enuma lâ ittazi sâru istu bi sarri beli-su û balidh summa istapar ana ardi-su û balidh* [*ana*] *dariti*, 'What is the life of a vassal when the breath goes not forth from the mouth of the king his lord? Yet he lives if (the king) sends (it) to his servant, yea, he lives for ever.'

5. In Assyrian: *ragga yumisamma ikpudu*, 'they devised evil every day,' where *ragga* has perhaps caused the introduction of *raq*, 'only,' into the Hebrew text. The Babylonian Deluge also was a punishment for sin; Ellil (Bel) was angry with the whole human race, and condemned it to death accordingly. He assented to the escape of Utu-napistim only when Ea laid down the rule that 'the (individual) sinner should bear his own sin, the transgressor his own transgression,' and that it was therefore unjust to confound the innocent with the guilty.

6, 7. In the Babylonian story it was not the creator, Ea or Bel-Merodach, who launched the Deluge, but Ellil of Nippur. The Hebrew writer, in opposition to Babylonian polytheism, is careful to point out that the creator and the author of the Deluge were one and the same. We have here the same underlying thought and purpose as in the first chapter, to which these verses take us back, and which they presuppose.

'It grieved him at his heart'; so in the Babylonian Penitential Psalms: 'My lord was wroth in his heart.' The phrase, 'the heart (of such and such a deity) was vexed' (*libbu eziz* or *igug*) is common in Assyrian, and is especially used of Bel-Merodach.

7. אֶמְחֶה is the Ass. *makhû*, 'to destroy,' which is connected with *mêkhu*, 'the storm of the deluge,' and is therefore specially applicable to the destruction caused by the Flood. In the Babylonian story of the Deluge it is Istar who describes mankind as her offspring: this is implicitly contradicted by the Hebrew writer.

Yahweh was angry with men, not with the animals, and it was men whom He repented of having

made. But the animals also were involved in the destruction brought about by the Deluge; hence the insertion of the words, 'from man to beast,' etc., with reference to Gn $1^{26.28}$. They more probably come from the Hebrew translator, or a later scribe, than from the cuneiform original.

8. The construction is like that of Gn 1^{2}, 'now Noah had found favour' before the destruction of mankind by the Deluge was determined upon. In the Babylonian story Utu-napistim found favour in the sight of Ea, not of Ellil, who was the author of the Deluge: the Hebrew writer once more emphasizes the fact that the author of the Deluge and the preserver of Noah were one and the same.

Literature.

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

Being within sight of the end of the 'Cambridge Modern History,' and being well advanced with the 'Cambridge History of English Literature,' the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press have begun the issue of *The Cambridge Medieval History*. The work has been planned by Professor Bury; the editors are Professor Gwatkin and Mr. Whitney. The first volume deals with the Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdoms (Cambridge: At the University Press; 20s. net).

It will be noticed that the volumes are to be a little more expensive than the volumes of the 'Cambridge Modern History,' and much more expensive than those of the 'Cambridge History of English Literature.' That may be due to the expectation of a smaller circulation; but, after a thorough and careful study of this volume, we have come to the conclusion that it is worth the money on its merits. Some slight improvements, we are told, have been made on the plan of the work as the result of experience, but our belief is that that is as nothing compared with the advance that has been made in the art of editing. For we have little doubt that it is due to the editors, and not to the individual contributors, that this volume can be read as if it were written by one man, and the mental jolting that we used to experience in passing from one chapter to another is almost entirely absent. And yet each author retains his individuality. He is allowed to select his own facts, and to make his own impression.

This smoothness is the more surprising that the range of subject is so great. That range is from Mr. C. H. Turner's chapter on 'The Organisation of the Church' to the chapter on 'The Asiatic Background' by Dr. Peisker of Graz. These chapters not only express the range of the work, they also express its characteristics. They show us that it is not a popular book for easy reading at the fireside, or a student's manual to be got up in the face of an examination. It may be read easily, but easy reading will only skim the surface of it; it may be studied by the student, but if he crams it for an examination he will do injustice both to himself and to it. It is to be read chiefly by those who have passed all their examinations, but are students still; it is to be read by them for the ascertaining of facts, and they will be able to rely upon the facts which are presented to them here; for the men chosen to write the chapters are specialists, each in his own particular domain, and the editors are men of eagle eye who let nothing slip. But more than that, it will be read by them for that higher education which no school or university can give, but only the after experience of life and the study of such a book as this.

There is another difference between the Medieval History and the Modern. The Medieval History is much more easily quoted. Take this from Mr. Turner's article: 'In the early days of Christianity the first beginnings of a new community were of a very simple kind: indeed, the local organisation had at first no need to be anything but rudimentary, just because the community was never thought of as complete in itself apart from its apostolic founder or other representatives of the missionary ministry. "Presbyters" and "deacons" no doubt existed in these communities from the first: "presbyters" were ordained for each church as it was founded on St. Paul's first missionary journey; "bishops and deacons" constitute, to-

gether with the "holy people," the church of Philippi. These purely local officials were naturally chosen from among the first converts in each district, and to them were naturally assigned the duties of providing for the permanently recurring needs of Christian life, especially the sacraments of Baptism—St. Paul indicates that baptism was not normally the work of an apostle—and the Eucharist. But the evidence of the earlier epistles of St. Paul is decisive as to the small relative importance which this local ministry enjoyed: the true ministry of the first generation was the ordered hierarchy, "first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers," of which the apostle speaks with such emphasis in his first epistle to the Corinthians. Next in due order after the ranks of the primary ministry came the gifts of miracles—"then powers, then gifts of healing"—and only after these, wrapped up in the obscure designation of "helps and governments," can we find room for the local service of presbyters and deacons.'

Then, by way of contrast, take this description of Shamanism found in the chapter on the Asiatic Background: 'The characteristic feature of Shamanism is the belief in the close union of the living with their long dead ancestors; thus it is an uninterrupted ancestor worship. This faculty, however, is possessed only by a few families, those of the Shamans (Mong. *shaman*, Turk. *kam*), who pass on their power from father to son, or sometimes daughter—with the visible symbol of the Shaman drum by means of which he can call up the spirits through the power of his ancestors, and compel them to active assistance, and can separate his own soul from his body and send it into the kingdoms of light and of darkness. He prepares the sacrifice, conjures up the spirits, leads prayers of petition and thanksgiving, and in short is doctor, soothsayer, and weather prophet. In consequence he is held in high regard, but is less loved than feared, as his ceremonies are uncanny, and he himself dangerous if evil inclined. The chosen of his ancestors attains to his Shaman power not by instruction but by sudden inspiration; he falls into a frenzy, utters inarticulate cries, rolls his eyes, turns himself round in a circle as if possessed, until, covered with perspiration, he wallows on the ground in epileptic convulsions; his body becomes insensible to impressions; according to accounts, he swallows automatically, and without subsequent injury, red-hot iron, knives, and needles, and brings them up again dry. These passions get stronger and stronger, till the individual seizes the Shaman drum and begins "shamaneering." Not before this does his nature compose itself, the power of his ancestors has passed into him, and he must thenceforth "shamaneer." He is, moreover, dressed in a fantastic garb hung with rattling iron trinkets. The Shaman drum is a wooden hoop with a skin, painted with gay figures, stretched over both sides, and all kinds of clattering bells and little sticks of iron upon it. In "shamaneering" the drum is vigorously struck with one drum-stick, and the ancestors thus invoked interrogated about the cause of the evil which is to be banished, and the sacrifice which is to be made to the divinity in order to avert it. The beast of sacrifice is then slaughtered and eaten, the skin together with all the bones is set aside as the sacrificial offering. Then follows the conjuration-in-chief, with the most frantic hocus-pocus, by means of which the Shaman strives to penetrate with his soul into the highest possible region of heaven in order to undertake an interrogation of the god of heaven himself.'

One of the most instructive chapters is the chapter entitled 'Thoughts and Ideas of the Period,' written by the Rev. H. F. Stewart, B.D., Fellow of St. John's College. It gives us a clear conception of the air that was breathed by mediæval men. We close with one short quotation from it: 'The notion of a spherical earth was favoured in classical antiquity even by geocentricians. But the words of Psalmist, Prophet, and Apostle required a flat earth over which the heavens could be stretched like a tent, and the believers in a globe with antipodes were scouted with arguments borrowed from Lucretius the epicurean and materialist. Augustine denies the possibility, not of a rotund earth, but of human existence at the antipodes. "There was only one pair of original ancestors, and it was inconceivable that such distant regions should have been peopled by Adam's descendants." The logic is fair enough; the false premiss arises from the worship of the letter. The fact is that while as spiritual teachers the fathers are unrivalled, common-sense interpretation is rare enough in our period; it is not often that we find such sober judgment as is shown by Basil. "What is meant," he writes (*Hom. in Ps. xxviii.*), "by the voice of the Lord? Are we

to understand thereby a disturbance caused in the air by the vocal organs? Is it not rather a lively image, a clear and sensible vision imprinted on the mind of those to whom God wishes to communicate His thought, a vision analogous to that which is imprinted on our mind when we dream?"'

It must be added that with this first volume there goes a portfolio of maps.

Illuminative Flashes is the title of a collection of illustrations made by Mr. James Duff (Allenson; 1s.). Here is one of the flashes: 'A good story is told of Stonewall Jackson and old Miles, the Virginia Bridge Builder. The bridges were swept away so often by floods, or burned by the enemy, that Miles was as necessary to the Confederate army as Jackson himself. One day the Union troops had retreated and burned a bridge across the Shenandoah. Jackson determined to follow them, and summoned Miles. "You must put all your men on that bridge," said he, "they must work all night, and the bridge must be completed by daybreak. My engineer shall furnish you with the plan, and you can go right ahead." Early next morning, Jackson, in a very doubtful frame of mind, met the old Bridge Builder. "Well," said Jackson, "did the engineer give you the plan for the bridge?" "General," replied Miles, slowly, "the bridge is done. I don't know whether the picter is or not."'

The Golden Key (Allenson; 3s. 6d.) was suggested to Miss Lilian Street by *The Cloud of Witness*, and it betters its suggestion. The quotations are more to the point. It is also a handier birthday-book than the other.

Dr. Dale of Birmingham used to say that he read all the books on preaching he could lay his hands on. Let us say after him that we read all the books on Palestine that we can lay our hands on. Very likely Dr. Dale was sometimes disappointed; so are we. But both preaching and Palestine are great subjects, and it is scarcely possible for a man to write on either without saying something memorable. How often has a man come to himself, recognizing his own insignificance, when he entered the pulpit; and how often when he stood by the Lake of Gennesaret! And it is this sense of insignificance that enables a man to write memorably and to preach acceptably, for then the Spirit of God gives him something to preach and write.

The latest traveller in Palestine to write a book is the Rev. Charles Leach, D.D., M.P. Its title is *The Romance of the Holy Land* (Edward Arnold; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. Leach is an experienced traveller in Palestine. Before he went there first he made himself acquainted with the work which other men had done, and knew what to look for. Now he knows the land with an intimacy inferior only to those who reside in it, and he has passed the season of disillusionment. The glory of this least of all lands has now taken possession of him. Palestine has made him a poet.

Those who are in search of a simple and reliable history of the Old Testament, written from the point of view of a moderate higher criticism, should obtain *The Story of Israel and Judah* (Blackie; 5s. net). It is a popular book; that is to say, it demands no previous knowledge of its subject beyond such acquaintance with the books of the Old Testament as the average schoolboy may be expected to enjoy; but it is reliable and well written. The author is Mr. H. J. Chaytor, M.A., Headmaster of Plymouth College.

Many books are written on the ethics of Christianity, and they nearly always leave the suspicion in the mind of the reader that there is something between Christian and philosophical ethics that has not been explained or even appreciated. And the questions arise, What has Christian ethics to do with philosophical ethics? Why should the moral philosopher be so suspicious of ethical Christianity? Why should there be any separation between them at all?

These are just the questions that have pressed upon the mind of Dr. G. F. Barbour. He has accordingly written a book, first submitted as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Edinburgh University, and now much enlarged, entitled *A Philosophical Study of Christian Ethics* (Blackwood; 7s. 6d. net). And he has written it for the very purpose of bridging the gulf between philosophical ethics and the ethical teaching of the New Testament. He has written it, he says, in order to show how certain of the persistent problems of ethics appear in the teaching of the New Testament; and he examines the specifically

Christian answer to them, with the result that the New Testament teaching forms the completion and crown of the ethical thought both of the Greeks and of the modern world.

The book is, however, first and foremost, a manual of Christian Ethics. For the student of the New Testament, as well as for the student of the modern social problem, it will be found acceptable, and very valuable. Then, after that, it is a contribution to the great effort which is now being made to bring philosophical as well as scientific thinkers over to the side of Christ, or at least to lead them to make a fair examination of the claims of Christ to be the author of the highest ethical teaching. Coming from a young and able student of such transparent honesty of mind, it is welcome to those to whom Christ is all in all.

When the Revised Version was published, the objection was taken to it that it did not make every verse a separate paragraph. And the objection was very popular. Nobody seemed to ask if every verse ought to make a paragraph. Nobody seemed to think how ridiculous any other book would be if every sentence or half-sentence began a new paragraph. But there the objection was, and there it has remained. And now the Oxford and Cambridge Presses, willing to please everybody, have issued an edition of the Revised Version, without the marginal notes of the Revisers, and with the verses divided up into separate paragraphs. They have also marked the real paragraphs, however, so that it will be possible to read this latest edition of the Revised Version as it ought to be read. The prices range from 2s. 6d. net in cloth to 8s. 6d. net in Persian. Its exact title is *Holy Bible: Revised Version in Verses* (Cambridge: At the University Press).

The 'Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools' is now to appear in a revised and enlarged edition under the general editorship of Dr. A. W. Streane for the Old Testament, and the Rev R. Appleton, late Master of Selwyn College, for the New Testament. The page is a little larger, and the binding is more substantial. We liked the old light yellow binding very well, but it certainly did not hold out as this will do, and a strong binding is a good thing in a school book. Five volumes are out together: *Judges and Ruth*, by Dr. Sutherland Black and Dr. Streane; *1 Kings*, by Mr. T. H. Hennessy, M.A.; *Proverbs*, by Rev. J. R. Coates, B.A.; *Joel and Amos*, by Mr. J. C. H. How, M.A.; and the *Acts*, by Mr. H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A. (Cambridge: At the University Press; 1s. net each).

What a stir the Revised Version of 1881 and 1885 made; how quietly has the Revision of 1911 been received. Its title is *The 1911 Tercentenary Commemoration Bible* (Oxford University Press; prices from 8s. 6d. to 35s. net). It is an edition of the Authorized Version, as for that matter the Revised Version was, but the text of the Authorized Version has been scrutinized in the light of the best modern research (we use the editor's own words) with the view of correcting such passages as are recognized by all scholars as in any measure misleading or needlessly obscure. The scrutiny, we are informed, was committed to a committee of thirty-four eminent Hebrew and Greek scholars, representative of all the great evangelical bodies and many foremost Universities and Schools of Divinity. Besides the correction of the text, there are three distinct features of the edition: first, it contains Scofield's system of chain references; secondly, a new collected-reference system; and thirdly, a new method of paragraphing.

The Rev. Joseph Agnew of Dunbar has written a book for Bible classes which will be right welcome to teachers of these classes. For it is the experience of many teachers of Bible classes that no subject of study is found so interesting as the life of Christ. But the life of Christ must be treated in the right way. Mere Sabbath-school work will not do. This is Mr. Agnew's method. The great incidents in Christ's life are associated with places. He has taken each place, opened his study with a light description of it, described the incidents associated with it, and then made it the occasion of some specific influence first on Christ Himself and then on us. The title of the first chapter, for example, is 'Bethlehem—Beginnings'; the title of the third is 'Egypt—Shelters'; the title of the fifth is 'The Temple (II.)—Early Interest in Religion.' We have seen nothing finer in the way of suggestion or even of clear working out. The title of the book is *Life's Christ Places* (T. & T. Clark; 3s. 6d. net).

It is customary for the preacher on the Beati-

tudes to follow St. Matthew's Gospel and ignore St. Luke's, but the Rev. Hubert Foston, M.A., D.Lit., makes a point of taking St. Luke with him. His interpretation of the Beatitudes depends upon taking St. Luke with him. From first to last he lays the two versions together, and out of the combination or contrast he brings new meaning, fresh exposition, strong modern application. It is not with Mr. Foston a case of choice between two. He does not ask whether it is 'Blessed are the pure in spirit,' or 'Blessed are ye poor'; it is both together, and more than that. Taking both versions together he finds it possible to show the relation of one Beatitude to another, and carries his interpretation in a methodical manner from the beginning to the end. The title of his book is *The Beatitudes and the Contrasts* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net).

Mr. M. W. Hilton-Simpson was invited in the summer of 1907 to join Mr. Emil Torday, the Hungarian traveller, in an expedition which he was about to undertake in the Kasai basin of the Congo Free State. He accepted the invitation; and when the expedition was over he wrote a narrative of the two years' journey among the cannibals of the Equatorial Forest and other savage tribes of the South-Western Congo. The book is illustrated with many photographs and with eight full-page coloured plates. The title is, *Land and Peoples of the Kasai* (Constable; 16s. net).

Mr. Hilton-Simpson did not go on travel for the purpose of writing a book. He is a traveller pure and simple. He makes no attempt to produce a fascinating account of his experiences, and probably his experiences were much more thrilling than the reader is able to realize. But he has the art of telling his story in a straightforward, credible way, and there is a ripple of humour running through it which affords much more entertainment than the best writing of the professional bookmaker would have done. He and Mr. Torday were sometimes in considerable risk of their lives, and sometimes their lives were preserved by means of a toy elephant. Mr. Hilton-Simpson had received from home one of those entertaining mechanical toys, and he did not scruple to use it whenever he found it likely to be useful.

'Later on we saw the second chief of the village loitering near our camp. This man had always appeared to us to be less inclined for war than his colleague, the old wizard, so Torday called out to him to come and talk matters over with us. After a little hesitation he came. Torday explained to him that although we did not want war, we were by no means afraid of it, and showed the chief our guns. We also related a few shooting stories, not all of them, perhaps, strictly true, in which we dwelt upon the enormous number of buffalo, etc., that daily fell to our rifles when we took the trouble to go out shooting; and Torday gave the man to understand that the presence of a great fetish was responsible for our success in the use of our guns. The chief could not suppress his curiosity as to the nature of this "fetish," and Torday, after pretending that he scarcely dared to worry it by introducing strangers, finally agreed to show it to him. He entered his tent, and wound up the clock-work elephant, while I remained outside with the chief. At a word from Torday I drew back the flap and gently pushed the native in. The elephant began to move. One glance at the little toy walking along the top of a gun-case, waving its trunk in the semi-darkness of the tent, was sufficient for the chief; with a gasp of fear he sprang backward through the tent door and attempted to bolt. We insisted upon his having another look, but it was a very brief one, and crying, "I will bring you back those chickens we have stolen," the old man rushed off to the village as hard as his legs could carry him. A stir was immediately noticeable among the Bakongo, and after some delay a party of them came over to us, bringing with them the stolen fowls. Torday then gave a discourse upon the might of our "elephant," but declined to disturb it again to satisfy their curiosity; he informed the people, however, that it never slept, so that any attempt to surprise us could only result in rousing it to anger, with horrible consequences to the offender.'

From Drummond's Tract Depot in Stirling there come three attractive evangelical volumes, of which the titles are: (1) *Where the Cross-Roads Meet*; (2) *Upper Springs and Other Musings for the Quiet Hour*; and (3) *The Immortal Hope* (each 1s. net). The last is an answer to Job's question, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' It is the answer of the late Rev. G. G. Green, M.A., of Lancefield Church, Glasgow. It is an answer in sympathy with earnest

doubters everywhere, though the author himself has found the answer in the words of Christ, 'Because I live, ye shall live also.' From the Drummond Tract Depot there come also the annual volume of *Good News* (4d.), *The Gospel Trumpet* (1s.), and *The British Messenger* (1s. 6d.). In all these there is the steady progress made that magazines must make for dear life's sake. But there is no change in the essential message which they deliver.

There are not many men in our day or generation who have done more to commend Christ and the Christian ideal to unbelievers than Professor A. S. Peake, of the University of Manchester. He knows the whole range of Christian apologetic, and he knows men. He speaks with the authority of the exact scholar, and he speaks without arrogance. Professor Peake is never tired commending Christ, and we will vouch for it that he never commends Him without good results following. His latest book is a full, direct, and most persuasive statement of the Christian hope. The author comes into touch with the men he is writing for, and asks their own questions—'What is religion?' 'Has theology had its day?' 'Which is the best religion?' He passes to the great matters of sin, resurrection, personal salvation. The title of the book is *Christianity: Its Nature and its Truth* (Duckworth; 2s. 6d. net).

Mr. Henry Rose has made himself the interpreter of Maeterlinck. Having already written a book on Maeterlinck's symbolism, with special reference to *The Blue Bird*, he has now written a supplement to it with the title of *On Maeterlinck; or, Notes on the Study of Symbols* (Fifield; 1s. net), to which he has added an exposition of 'The Sightless.' Mr. Rose will help somewhat to an understanding of Maeterlinck. He will tell you, for example, what Maeterlinck means by 'the grass that sings.' 'It means,' he says, 'that, though the knowledge of the advanced forms of physical science is good, it is of relatively little importance to Man's higher spiritual needs.'

Mr. Rufus M. Jones, who has written so much on Quakerism, and as a Quaker, now turns from philosophical and ethical problems to tell some *Stories of Hebrew Heroes* to little children (Headley; 2s. 6d. net).

The most piquant and therefore the most popular writers of the present day are the mildly, but unmistakably, unorthodox. But one grows tired of them. They may be fresh, but they are not refreshing. A truly refreshing writer, stimulating and strengthening, is Dr. A. E. Garvie, the Principal of New College, London. A truly stimulating and strengthening book is his *Studies of Paul and his Gospel* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

The angels and the miracles stand or fall together. With many writers of our day, even writers of theology, the question of miracles is no longer debated. And so also is it with the question of angels. It is settled according to Huxley's dictum, 'There are none.' But if the belief in angels and miracles must go, the belief in the authority of Scripture must go first. Accordingly the Rev. J. Howard Swinstead, M.A., having still belief in the authority of Scripture, believes also in angels, and gives an account of them, the place they occupy, and the good they do, in a book which he entitles *In a Wonderful Order* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net).

With the issue of a third substantial volume, Dr. Carroll completes his exposition of Dante. This third volume deals with the Paradiso. The title he has given to it is *In Patria* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). Now we have had an exposition of the Paradiso quite recently from the hand of a master, and Dr. Carroll might well have hesitated, as he says he did hesitate, to continue his work to the end after the appearance of Mr. Edmund G. Gardner's beautiful book, published in 1904, under the title of *Dante's Ten Heavens*. But it is scarcely possible to have too much exposition of Dante, and as yet we have certainly not had enough of the Paradiso. Moreover, Dr. Carroll addresses a different audience, and works on quite sufficiently different lines to give a reason for his book and make it acceptable. There is an immense amount of matter in it, for it is a volume of 560 pages, each page printed in close type and with plenty of footnotes.

The student of Dante's Paradiso has to be a student of scholasticism. No doubt everything has been discovered by somebody already, but it is not enough to know the individual references, one must enter into the atmosphere. Dr. Carroll confesses that he has gone for help to Father

Joseph Rickaby, but he has manifestly made himself well enough acquainted with the scholastic philosophy to feel at ease.

There is a good example in the case of Rhipeus. The teaching of Aquinas is that baptism is absolutely necessary for salvation, since only through it are we united to Christ. Now Rhipeus never was baptized. How then is he found in Paradise? This is the way of it. Aquinas distinguishes three baptisms, the Baptism of Water, the Baptism of Blood, and the Baptism of Desire. The Baptism of Blood is martyrdom, fellowship in the Passion of Christ; the Baptism of Desire is when the heart within is moved by the Holy Spirit to faith and love and patience, and by this the effect of baptism is communicated to the soul apart from either water or blood. This is the baptism received by Rhipeus; the Spirit of God wrought within his heart the supernatural virtues of faith, hope, and love, and these formed the Baptism of Desire.

There is an anecdote in the life of Cardinal Vaughan which illustrates the use that may be made of the Baptism of Desire. When Cardinal Vaughan was Bishop of Salford, he was induced to visit the Salvation Army shelters. In one room, says Mr. Wilfrid Meynell, who tells the story, sat a number of women, mostly old women, at various sorts of needlework. 'Are any of my people here?' asked the Bishop, addressing the assembly. And, dotted about the room, aged dames, in the dignity of Poverty, stood up for their Faith. Then the Bishop turned on the Captain: 'And do these attend Protestant prayers?' 'They attend the praises of God every evening.' 'And what do you preach?' 'We preach Christ and Him Crucified, and we shall be very pleased if you will stay and so preach Him this evening. We are quite unsectarian.' This was too much. 'Well, but if I told them that unless they were baptized they could not be saved?' 'I should tell them that it was not true,' said the Captain. 'And *I* should tell them that it was not true,' echoed Cardinal Manning when he was told the story an hour later; 'I should explain to them the Church's doctrine of the Baptism of Desire.'

What does the modern Evangelical believe? The first answer that some will give is that he believes in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but the true answer will be found in a volume entitled *Evangelical Christianity: Its History and Witness* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). The volume contains a series of lectures which were delivered at Mansfield College in the Hilary term 1911. It is edited by Rev. W. B. Selbie, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College. First there is an introductory lecture by Professor Vernon Bartlet on the 'Protestant Idea of Church and Ministry as rooted in early Christianity'; then follow the lectures which tell us what evangelical Christianity is, according to the belief of an evangelical of the Church of England, the Rev. A. J. Carlyle, D.Litt.; an evangelical of the Presbyterian Churches, Professor John Oman, D.D.; an evangelical of Congregationalism, the Rev. F. J. Powicke, Ph.D.; an evangelical from the Baptist Church, Dr. Newton H. Marshall; an evangelical of the Society of Friends, Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A.; and a Methodist evangelical, Professor A. S. Peake, D.D.

There has been so much discussion within recent years of the difficult problems in the history of Scotland that it has now become possible for any well-equipped historian to write *A Short History of the Scottish People* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). The man who has written it is Dr. Donald Macmillan, the author of the 'Life of Dr. George Matheson' and other works. The problems have not all been resolved, but some of them have been resolved, and it has been made clear to what extent the rest must be left in obscurity.

The period of deepest interest in the history of Scotland, to those within the land as well as to those without, is the reign of Mary. To that reign Dr. Macmillan has given three chapters of his book, and he might have given much more without offence. But, as we have already suggested, he has not discussed the difficult problems that arise in it; he has accepted the results of recent discussion. We are glad of one thing: he is just to John Knox. Justice to John Knox does not involve injustice to Queen Mary; but the man who cannot see how great Knox was, how patriotic and how sincere, how great in his gentleness as well as in his strength, cannot understand Scotland and is unfit to write its history. No one can call Dr. Macmillan a partisan, and yet there is nothing in his book of that contemptible balancing of probabilities in

estimating the character of a man or a woman. He accepts the verdict of History herself, knowing that no discovery of a letter in some foreign library is enough to alter that verdict. If we have any fault to find with him in his estimation of character, it is that he is somewhat hard upon King James. The faults of that 'Most High and Mighty Prince' were manifest to the eyes of all men, but the eyes of the historian should look deeper. James not only did things that deserve everlasting gratitude, but with all his pedantry he was on the side of righteousness. Dr. Macmillan never says otherwise, but he leaves the impression that James VI. was a smaller man than the verdict of history accounts for.

Is it only accident or is it of divine purpose that in one month several books of definite evangelical teaching have appeared? It cannot be accident that divests them of things which evangelical Christianity has nothing to do with, making them thereby so much more convincing. One of them is the statement by Canon J. Denton Thompson of the position, principles, and policy of evangelical Churchmen in relation to modern thought and work. Its title is *Central Churchmanship* (Longmans; 2s. net). What is 'Central Churchmanship'? 'Fidelity to the great doctrine of the centrality of the atoning death of Christ is undoubtedly one of the distinguishing marks of the Evangelical Churchman, and if this be lacking, then, whatever men may call themselves or be called, they are not entitled to be classed among "Evangelicals."' But, says Canon Thompson, many High Churchmen teach the central character of the Lord's death; and he comes to the conclusion that evangelical Churchmanship is rather a protest against additions than against defects, these additions being found chiefly in connexion with the Holy Communion.

The articles which have recently appeared in *The Guardian* in answer to Mr. J. M. Thompson's book on *Miracles in the New Testament* have been published by Messrs. Longmans in a volume with the title of *Miracles*. We have already commended the articles; it is enough to repeat the statement that their authors are Professor Lock, Professor Sanday, Professor Scott Holland, Mr. H. H. Williams, and Dr. Headlam (2s. 6d. net).

A sketch of *The Ministry of Our Lord* has been written by Bishop Drury (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). Ellicott's order of events is followed, but the ground has been travelled independently. It is a Bible Class book, and to Bible Classes the synoptical tables at the end, as well as the narrative itself, will be very useful.

Messrs. Macmillan have now added to their 'Shilling Library' *The Man-Eaters of Tsavo*, by Lieut.-Col. J. H. Patterson, D.S.O. The book was first published in 1907; since then it has run through some ten or twelve editions.

Messrs. Macmillan have also published a cheap edition of the first Earl of Selborne's *Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment* (1s. net). It contains an additional chapter on the Report of the Royal Commission on the Church in Wales.

If you do not yet possess a fine edition of White's *Selborne* you need not search for a finer than the edition which Messrs. Macmillan have just published. It is a large octavo, printed on thick paper with wide margins, and it is illustrated in colour by George Edward Collins, R.B.A. There are twenty-four full-page illustrations, and not one of them is beyond comprehension or below success. They do suggest more than they say, but so does Gilbert White himself. The whole title is *The Natural History and Antiquities of Selborne in the County of Southampton by Gilbert White* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Methuen have added *Death* to their translations of Maurice Maeterlinck (3s. 6d. net). It is a book to make one think, not about Death, but about Maurice Maeterlinck. He is in dread of death, and he thinks we are all in dread of it; and 'the more we dread it, the more dreadful,' he says, 'it becomes, for it battens but on our fears.' And how does he strive to get over the dread of Death? By remembering the days of his life that were good. Then, 'instead of the terrible prayer of the dying, which is the prayer of the depths, he would say his own prayer, that of the peaks of his life, where would be gathered, like angels of peace, the most limpid, the most pellucid thoughts of his life. Is not that,' he says, 'the prayer of prayers?'

In 1905, Dr. R. F. Horton issued a little book

entitled *Does the Cross Save?* To that book he has now added four additional chapters of explanation and defence, and given it the new title of *How the Cross Saves* (F. B. Meyer: Memorial Hall, E.C.). For every year brings more confidence in the Cross, and more hope for those who need saving. This is always the way with those who have themselves found it the power of God unto salvation.

We have much pleasure in commending an Anthology which has been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott for the China Inland Mission. Its title is *Hudson Taylor's Choice Sayings* (1s. net). We shall rather let it commend itself by quoting this one saying: 'The Lord does not require anything outside of that which He has given to His people, to accomplish His present purposes, whatever they may be.'

Facing the Facts is an excellent title (Nisbet; 6s. net). It is the title of a volume of essays edited by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, and contributed by men of nearly all the parties in the Church, who agree in one thing only, that taking their task seriously, they write conscientiously about it. How does it stand with religion to-day, with religion as represented by the Churches? It stands not well, say these writers. They nearly all say so, from the Bishop of Hull to Professor Johnston Ross of Montreal. The editor admits the prevailing pessimism of the book, and simply says it is inevitable. What is the remedy? Professor Johnston Ross, for one, says the remedy lies in a different style of preaching. 'There is, I am convinced, a desire to be preached to about the great fundamental truths of religion, truths which have been obscured it may be by an "evangelical" Christolatry, a Jesus-cultus not quite according to the mind even of Christ Himself. Do we preach enough about *God*—about His Unity, His pursuit of us as a Wooing Spirit, His presence with men through many media?' Well, it is worth thinking about. Professor Johnston Ross is never conventional, and he is sometimes right.

To the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES a volume called *The Road* needs no recommendation. It needs no recommendation beyond the statement of its extreme artistic beauty of form and of chaste full-page illustration. It is the republication in book form of those studies of the *Pilgrim's Progress* which Dr. Kelman has contributed to our pages (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net).

A Journalist in the Holy Land (R.T.S.; 5s. net). This is the title of a book which Mr. Arthur E. Copping has written and Mr. Harold Copping has illustrated. It will be bought for its illustrations, for the illustrations are numerous and new; even the Sphinx is new, having been sketched from behind, and looks a little like a family umbrella. But a family umbrella is, of course, not required in Egypt, and so curiosity is excited. If not to keep off rain, what is the Sphinx for? and at once we are up against the everlasting unanswerable. But the illustrations are not only new and numerous, they are Mr. Harold Copping's. The book will be bought for its illustrations, but the book ought to be bought for its reading. Do not imagine that Mr. Arthur Copping went to Palestine with Mr. Harold Copping in order to enable him to glue his pictures together and make a volume of them. The writing is fresh. Our journalist has found something in Palestine and in Egypt worth writing about.

Messrs. Revell have once more issued Arnold's *Practical Sabbath-School Commentary on the International Lessons*. The volume for 1912 is edited by the Rev. David S. Warner, A.M. (2s. 6d. net).

The Pedagogics of Preaching may not be an attractive title, but it is the title of a practical book. The book contains the substance of lectures delivered by Thiselton Mark, D.Lit., B.Sc., at Hartley College, Manchester, in 1910 and 1911 (Revell; 1s. 6d. net).

Dr. James M. Gray has written an account of the doctrine of Salvation, or rather of its experiences. He has called his book *Salvation from Start to Finish* (Revell; 1s. 6d. net).

The Colè Lectures for 1911 were delivered by Mr. Robert E. Speer. The Cole Lectures, which are delivered before Vanderbilt University, are expected to be popular in style, and Mr. Speer determined to select *Some Great Leaders in the World Movement*, and to offer a sketch of their career (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). By the World Movement, Mr. Speer means the work of the missionary. His leaders are Raymond Lull, William Carey, Alexander Duff, George Bowen, John Lawrence, and Charles George Gordon.

The sketch of each of these men is of no superficial nature. Their life is shown to lead to their work, and then their work is shown to be contributory to the great World Movement; and each in its own way has fulfilled the prayer, 'Thy Kingdom come.'

Mr. Henry W. Clark's work is all finished work. His sermon-essays are so carefully expressed that you never miss the point or for a moment are thrown in the wrong direction. And the point is nearly always worth seeing. Work like his will keep the sermon-essay alive. To his new book he has given the title, *Towards the Perfect Man* (Robert Scott; 2s. net).

Mr. Frederick J. Cross has devised a new birthday book with the new title of *A Little Book of Effort* (Simpkin; 1s. net). At the bottom of each page there is a question; as, 'Do I give way to anger without just cause?' Then the page is filled with texts of Scripture for every day of the week dealing with Anger.

There are not many books of pure devotion this month. The two that have come seek their inspiration, both of them, from the Churches of the East.

Dr. F. W. Groves Campbell has translated the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom with certain additions and rearrangements, and it has been published by the Century Press (8 Henrietta Street, W.C.) under the title of *A Little Orthodox Manual of Prayers of the Holy Orthodox Catholic Church.*

The Rev. Lacy O'Leary, B.D., Lecturer in Aramaic and Syriac in Bristol University, has translated *The Daily Office and Theotokia of the Coptic Church* (Simpkin). Both are works of scholarship, not the less real that they are sent forth modestly.

The Creed of Half Japan (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 7s. 6d. net) will give to those who read it some idea of the loss that the world has sustained in the sudden death of its author, Professor Arthur Lloyd, M.A., of Tokyo. Professor Lloyd had his plans laid for a complete exposition of Japanese Buddhism, to be issued in three or four volumes. How far the work had proceeded we do not know. Fortunately this volume is complete in itself, and gives an account of the progress of Buddhism from the time when the Mahāyāna first made its appearance as a distinct element in the religious life of the East—that is to say, during the first century of the Christian era. Professor Lloyd believed that Buddhism and Christianity came into touch with one another almost at once, even in the first century of our era, and that they had considerable influence the one upon the other. It is an extremely difficult subject to handle, and it has been somewhat mishandled hitherto. But it is a subject of immense importance, and Professor Lloyd was just the man, by natural reserve, by training, by singular opportunity, and by simplicity of faith, to deal with it successfully. Once more we have evidence, and in this volume it is abundant, that the study of the New Testament has passed out of the purely literary into the religious and psychological stage. The elaborate explanations of commentators who know only the Greek language are at once antiquated when the larger field is occupied.

Take a single example. Professor Lloyd touches on the Nicolaitans. He recalls the statement of Irenæus that the Gospel of St. John was written for the purpose of combating the heresy of the Nicolaitans, and he gives reasons for believing that the Nicolaitans professed a form of Buddhism almost identical with that of the still-existing Shingon sect of Japan.

The Rev. C. F. Nolloth has studied thoroughly the subject of our Lord's historical existence, working his way through all the dreary literature that the last few years have produced. In a single lecture, published by the S.P.C.K. under the title of *The Historic Personality of Christ*, you will find everything on the subject that you need to know.

Mr. Hubert L. Simpson, M.A., has written an account of the mission stations of the United Free Church of Scotland, and of all the men and women who are at work in them—a racy, readable story, and well illustrated. It is published at the offices of the Church in Edinburgh under the title of *Our Mission Fields 1910–1911* (3d.).

In the German Athenæum in London a lecture was delivered by Mr. Ernest J. Schuster, which was afterwards published in German under the

title of *Die Ehefrau in alter und neuer Zeit.* It has now been published in English under the title of *The Wife in Ancient and Modern Times* (Williams & Norgate; 4s. 6d. net). It is an historical account of the treatment of women as wives, with a modern application. The modern application turns upon the alternative marriage or free love. This is Mr. Schuster's conclusion: 'If the noblest thing in life is to yield to every instinct without regard to the consequences, free union is undoubtedly preferable to marriage; if, on the other hand, the highest object is the performance of duties, the best help for the attainment of that object is a marriage between persons willing and able to bear each other's burdens, terminable by death alone.'

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have now published the fourth volume of Pfleiderer's *Primitive Christianity* (10s. 6d. net). The translation has been made by the Rev. W. Montgomery, B.D. This volume completes the translation, and Mr. Montgomery has added to it an extremely valuable index of citations from the New Testament, the Jewish Apocrypha, and the Early Christian Writings. Nothing further need be said about the book itself; the translation is done by a master in that art.

Mr. C. Louis Leipoldt, F.R.C.S., has written a book on *Common-Sense Dietetics* (Williams & Norgate; 2s. 6d. net). Emphasize 'Common-Sense.' Mr. Leipoldt's theory is, Find out what does you most good, and eat that. For faddists he has an aversion which he can express in language that leaves nothing to be desired for vigour. 'The diet faddist,' he says, 'is an annoying and irritating being to the student of dietetics. Of late years his class has multiplied out of all proportion to the benefits which he confers on the race, and he has attained to corporate dignity. Formerly he ramped alone, like the lion of Scotland in its counterfleury, but now he is banded into societies, and has become gregarious. He appears in various forms and disguises. The one variety sedulously avoids carbo-hydrate food. The other speaks learnedly of "purin-free basis," and makes balderdash of the simplest menu by inverting the most ordinary principles of physiological chemistry. This one is a nutarian; that one a fruitarian; his brother on the other side boasts himself a vegetarian; this is a great meat man; this a sour-milk votary; and as an addendum we have a whole host of varieties, ranging from the grape-eating enthusiast to that incomprehensible being who abhors asparagus, and imagines that mankind can only exist happily if it never cooks its food.'

Contributions and Comments.

John vii. 38, 39.

'As the Scripture hath said, *out of his belly* shall flow rivers of living water.' But there is no such text in the Old Testament. There are two reasons, however, why it is probable that the reference is to Zec 14^8. First, this passage is nearest in form to the quotation in the Fourth Gospel; second, this chapter of Zechariah is now read as the prophetic lesson for the first day of Tabernacles, to the last day of which the Gospel refers (v.^{37}). But if this be the passage cited, how can we account for the variation, especially in the words italicized above? For Zec 14^8 runs: 'Living waters shall go out *from Jerusalem.*' Does Rabbinic tradition throw any light on the substitution of *belly* for *Jerusalem*? Possibly it does. For the Talmud (expressing an idea which afterwards was so wide-spread) declares that the Sanctuary in Jerusalem was situated at the *navel* of the earth (Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin, fol. 37*a*). Hence I suggest that in the passage Jn 7^{38} *belly* is a synonym for *Jerusalem.* That, in the metaphor, Jerusalem and the temple are referred to, is confirmed by Jl 3^{18}, Ezk 47^2 *seq.* The Fourth Gospel shows throughout this context a peculiarly exact familiarity with Jewish traditions. With the Feast of Tabernacles was associated the great Temple Ceremony of the Water-drawing, which would further account for the use of the figure. The following words of St. John, 'but this he spake of the Spirit,' also accords with Jewish exegesis. For the ceremony of the Water-drawing was actually interpreted in this very way, as referring to the Holy Spirit, in the Midrash Rabba to Gn 29^2 (chap. 70 of the Midrash).

I. Abrahams.

Cambridge.

Belshazzar's Feast.

An explanation has occurred to me of the wonderful story in the fifth chapter of Daniel, which, though it is merely conjecture, may be thought worthy of consideration. 'There came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote . . . and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote.' Now we are not told that any one else but the king saw the fingers, and the phenomenon seems to be similar to the ghost of Banquo as seen by Macbeth, that is, purely subjective, the product, in Belshazzar's case, of *delirium tremens*. On the other hand, the writing remained, and my theory is that it was there beforehand, although the king had not happened to see it. The words *Mene*, *Tekel*, and *Parsin* are just what would be suitable to a steward's room, which may have communicated with the banqueting hall. *Mene* may have been written on the wall over the place where the tributes of goods brought for the royal table were received and counted; *Tekel*, over the place where they were weighed, and *Parsin*, over the place where they were classified according to quality. Some serving-man may have left the door into the banqueting hall open so that the words caught the king's eye at a moment when his conscience was struggling with his clouded brain, and the lights of the candlestick may have contributed to produce the awful effect. Nevertheless, it was a message from God, though produced, as Divine messages usually are, by natural means. Then why could no one read the writing till Daniel was brought? It may have been in an archaic script, such as Gothic letters would be to us. It is easy to dismiss the whole tale as a romance, but it must have had a kernel of fact, and the discoveries of Assyriologists have proved in recent years that Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, had a son named Bel-sarra-usur, and a mutilated inscription tells us that just after the fall of the city, 'the son of the king died.' The coincidence that Nabonidus was still alive, according to the inscriptions, and that Daniel was proclaimed, according to our Scripture, as the *third* ruler in the kingdom, is very remarkable. Who knows but some day the fateful inscription may itself be found, and that it may prove the truth of my conjecture? See Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*.

Margaret D. Gibson.

Cambridge.

Unbiblical Beliefs on Biblical Matters.

To the examples given by Professor Nestle of unbiblical beliefs might be added the prevalent ideas that the rainbow was *created* after the Flood, that the 'great fish' which swallowed Jonah was a whale, and that the site of Calvary was on a hill. The 'manger' at Bethlehem is often confused with the stable which contained it. A reputable writer has been known to say, 'The holy family were at this time probably still *living in the manger*.'

H. S. Marwick.

Aberdeen.

The Greeting in 2 Corinthians.

At the close of a letter a Syrian sent greetings to his friends, relatives, and all in the village where his correspondent lived. When asked if he knew these villagers, he answered: 'No. But some of them are sure to gather in the house when my letter is read, and they will be offended if there is no message for them.'

In such a personal letter as 2 Corinthians it is surprising to find in the salutation 'all the saints who are in all Achaia.' The presence of this phrase is surely to be explained along the lines of the Syrian's answer. The letter was meant for Corinthians only, but if there chanced to be a visitor from Achaia present he was not to feel out in the cold.

Arthur S. Tritton.

Edinburgh.

Frankenberg on the Odes of Solomon.[1]

The output of monographs upon the Odes continues. Frankenberg's treatise is remarkable for three things. He furnishes a Greek translation, with some valuable notes upon the text and the religious contents. He sides definitely with those who advocate the Christian origin of the Odes. And his estimate of them is depreciatory. He insists that they have no bearing on the Fourth Gospel or the life of Jesus; they are secondary, from a literary point of view, allied to the

[1] *Das Verständnis der Oden Salomos.* Von Lic. theol. Wilhelm Frankenberg. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft, xxi. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1911. M.5.

Alexandrian school of exegesis, and lacking in any original colour of their own. His views on the last-named point are extreme. They seem dictated now and then by a spirit of contradiction to extravagant estimates rather than by an impartial research into the characteristics of the Odes, but at least he has collected a mass of useful material by way of illustrating the affinities between the Odes and early Christian writers like Origen and Clement, Macarius and Gregory of Nyssa. In this respect the essay is a distinct contribution to the literature of the subject.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Oxford.

Matthew xviii. 10, οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν.

PROFESSOR RAMSAY, in the *Letters to the Seven Churches*, describes a Lydian monument which represents a sacrifice on earth and in heaven. On the heavenly plane the God is performing the same act of ritual as is being done by the priest for the worshippers on the earthly plane. This idea of two planes, a heavenly and an earthly, he finds in Rev 1^{20}, the Angels and the Stars in heaven corresponding to the Churches and the Lamps on earth. He then quotes Professor J. H. Moulton's description of angels, 'spiritual counterparts of human individuals or communities, dwelling in heaven, subject to changes depending on the good or evil behaviour of their complementary beings on earth.'

Jesus speaks of the 'angels of the children.' He lifts up the disciples to the thought of the heavenly plane where the children's angels ever behold the face of the Father. Do not despise the little ones. Do not do anything which would take away from them faith in a Heavenly Father. Remember that they come 'trailing clouds of glory.' Seek to keep them mindful of the imperial palace whence they came, where their angels have an undimmed vision of the face of the Father.

J. G. BERRY.

Leslie Manse, Insch.

Two Aspects of Faith (Heb. xi. 1).

THE Revised Version translates ὑπόστασις, *assurance*. But we cannot construe it with a genitive of the object because there is no corresponding transitive verb, and as a matter of fact this word has never been found with such a construction. It is used in Hellenistic Greek of the courage of troops *standing* firm *under* attack, and metaphorically of the soul under affliction. If we therefore accept the translation 'assurance of things hoped for,' we must take it in the sense not that faith makes the Christian feel sure of the things hoped for, but that the things hoped for give him assurance, confidence, a firm ground or foundation on which he may build his life and conduct. This may be called the practical aspect of faith which is illustrated in the rest of the chapter, and perhaps was intended as a conciliation of the apparent divergence between Paul and James about justification.

πραγμάτων strikes one at first as a redundant word. *Things* is almost always expressed merely by the use of the neuter plural. In both the LXX and the N.T. πράγματα means matters, deeds, events, actions, as in classical Greek. Notwithstanding its position it should therefore naturally be construed with ἐλπιζομένων, things hoped for being much more definite than things not seen.

The Revisers translate ἔλεγχος, *proving* or *test*. That is good classical usage, but not in accordance with its use and that of the cognate verb ἐλέγχω in the LXX and N.T. The word, or by another reading ἔλεγμός, occurs only in one other passage in N.T., 2 Ti 3^{16}, where it is translated *reproof*. But in LXX ἔλεγχος and ἔλεγμός are very common, and the corresponding word in English is almost always *reproof* or *rebuke*. Only in one passage, Nu 5, where in English we have *bitter water*, does ἔλεγμός mean *test* or *ordeal*. Similarly the verb, ἐλέγχω, in the vast majority of cases corresponds to *reprove* or *rebuke*, though sometimes to *chasten* or *correct*. In N.T. the Revisers have changed *reprove* in several passages into *convict*, but still have left *reprove* in ten out of sixteen of them, and in this very Epistle we have 'when thou art *rebuked* of him.' I would therefore suggest that in this passage we should translate: 'the *reproof* of things not seen.' This gives us the mystic aspect of faith.

The author evidently knows what it is to live 'as seeing him who is invisible'; as in touch with the intangible, not 'a mount that might be touched,' but 'the heavenly Jerusalem'; as hearing the inaudible, not 'the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words,' but 'the voice of him that warneth from heaven.'

But it may be objected:[1] How can this chiding voice of the unseen be an element in my faith? Is it not something external to me? That does not follow, for as the late Professor Tait said, 'I am a part of the Unseen Universe.'

Strange to say, *religion*, in the modern sense, is not once mentioned in the Bible. But all religion from the lowest to the highest type is founded on this apprehension of, or rather by, unseen powers; and of this the Bible is full.

This state of mind may be only occasional, for material realities, wants, and activities engross most of us so much. The vision may open to us 'in a season of calm weather,' but also in times of danger, of loss and sorrow, of stress and strain, such as the Hebrews were in when this Epistle was written.

Sir William Ramsay has made out a good case for Philip the evangelist as the author of the Hebrews, and Philip was apparently a man who had experience of being rapt in mystic moods. After baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch, it was not till he found himself at Azotus that he awoke to his mundane surroundings. JOHN ROSS.

Edinburgh.

Watering with the Foot.

IN corroboration of Mr. Gurney's remarks (Nov.) concerning the passage in Dt 11^{10}, I have often witnessed the same practice in Central and Southern Persia.

There the water, as it flows down the mountain-side in little streams, is conducted by narrow channels all over small patches of cultivated ground. These patches are formed in terrace-like plots, and the method of irrigating them is by a system of parallel furrows, the plots thus presenting the appearance of an English potato patch. These furrows conduct the water over all the plot of land, and every morning and evening the peasant turns in the water by pushing down the little barrier of soil at the end of the furrow *with his bare foot.* He conducts the water from furrow to furrow at will, and dams up the little stream, or guides the water into another plot of ground as may be desired in exactly the same way.

This method of irrigation has become quite an art among the Persian peasantry, and it is no uncommon thing to see boys at play copying their elders in tending a miniature garden in this identical way, and literally *watering it with their feet.*

The Persians (at least the villagers and mountain-dwellers) have not yet realized the utility of reservoirs, though in the city gardens, and in those of the more wealthy persons, where there are wells, cemented reservoirs built of brick are often attached to them. The same system of irrigation by means of channels or furrows made in a grid-iron pattern is equally in vogue there as on the mountain-side.

Thus the methods of *watering with the foot* employed to-day both in Africa and Asia afford a very simple explanation and a clear illustration of the passage which is otherwise obscure to the Western reader. EDWARD J. CLIFTON.

Leytonstone (*C.M.S., Persia*).

'Power on the Head.'

THE suggested explanation of 1 Co 11^{10} in the October issue, that 'women were under the guardianship of angels, who were their spiritual lovers,' and that during divine service the women 'were to wear talismans over the head' lest they should cast glances at their human husbands, and thus arouse the jealousy of their angelic lovers, is not altogether satisfactory.

May not the following throw some light on this admittedly difficult passage? The *Pulpit Commentary* says that ἐξουσία can have no other primary meaning than 'authority' (see R.V.), and adds: 'The context shows that the word has here a *secondary* sense, and implies *some kind of covering.*' But it must be borne in mind that this 'authority' or 'power' is in the possession of the woman herself, to use or to neglect, for the Apostle is speaking throughout of nature's gift to the woman of luxuriant hair—'given her for a covering' (15), marg. 'veil.' And the instruction intended to be conveyed would seem to be that the woman was expected to veil herself, either with her hair or with an artificial veil, in the assemblies of the saints.

And this—'because of the angels,'—ἄγγελος, as in the letters to the churches in Revelation,—according to Strong, 'a messenger,' 'a pastor.'

[1] Here note the perfect tense: 'Ye are come.' This is not eschatology, but mysticism.

Now, if this be the case, may we not find the most natural interpretation here,—that the Apostle was simply insisting upon the necessity of women observing the laws of modesty and propriety, by attending public worship duly veiled? In the East, the veil is a woman's defence, and therefore it was taught that in the Church, in that country and at that time, a woman should appear in the assembly of the saints with this 'power on her head,' the power that would shield her from prying eyes; and because she was to sit in the presence of the 'angels,' or 'messengers,' of the Churches, many of whom would be foreigners. Thomson's *The Land and the Book* has a suggestion to this effect, and it would be quite in line with Eastern custom to-day.

P. Rose.

The Parsonage, Malvern.

'Lord' in the A.V.

The Massorites have counted 134 passages in the Hebrew O.T. where אדני is written instead of יהוה. As the great *Massorah* of Ginsburg is in few hands, it is very convenient that the *Companion Bible* gave the list, in vol. i. App. 32. But there is missing Gn 18^{31}; and two corrections are necessary: Ezk 17^{20} instead of ^{29}, and Ps $35^{17.\ 22.\ 23}$ instead of $^{3.\ 17.\ 22}$.

It is the principle of the A.V. to print 'Lord' in these cases, while 'LORD' is reserved for יהוה, in imitation of the example given in Luther's German Bible. In three passages, where the impression of 1611 had 'LORD,' namely, Gn 18^{17} 20^{4}, Neh 1^{11}, it has been corrected in modern editions. In Ex 4^{10}, where 1611 has had 'lord' (no capital), we read now 'Lord.'[1]

In this list are some passages where at present our Hebrew Bibles have יהוה, the A.V. therefore LORD; for instance Is 38^{14}, on which passage the new Hebrew Bible of Ginsburg must now be compared; Mal 1^{12}, see again Ginsburg;[2] Ps 30^{8} (9).

[1] The following spellings I noticed in 1611: (1) lord, Ex 4^{10}; (2) Lord, 4^{13}; (3) LORD, 15^{17}; (4) LORD, Gn 18^{27}; (5) Lord, Ps 90^{1}, at the beginning; (6) Lorde, 130^{2}.

[2] Kittel prints אדני, and does not even mention the reading יהוה, though this is the reading of Jacob ben Chayyim. The reader cannot be warned earnestly enough against the belief that Kittel's edition is a 'careful reprint' of that of Jacob ben Chayyim, shared even by S. R. Driver (*The Expositor*, January 1910, p. 23). The editor's statements in the 'Prolegomena' and in the Publisher's announcements are painfully misleading.

On this passage the *Companion Bible* says: 'Some codices, with *one* early printed edition, read "Jehovah."' But it is not one only, but at least *two*. Jacob ben Chayyim had also יהוה (though neither Ginsburg in his former edition nor Kittel mentioned it), and several editions which followed him, for instance that of Theile. Finally, Ps 90^{17}; here already Baer restored אדני; Kittel does not even mention it. If we wished to bring the English Bible into agreement with this Massoretic list, we would have to remove the capitals in Is 38^{14}, Mal 1^{12}, Ps 30^{9b} 90^{17}.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

Psalm xxxi. 20.

'The secret of thy *presence*' (A.V.), or 'the covert of thy presence' (R.V.), is a strange expression. I think a reference to Ps 61^{4}, 'the covert of thy *wings*,' will convince every Hebrew scholar that with the smallest emendation we must read כְּנָפֶיךָ instead of פָּנֶיךָ. I wonder if the suggestion has been made before.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

'The Pinnacle of the Temple.'

I do not know whether any English work gives more on this expression than the *D.B.* iii. 882. I doubt it. Plummer at least remarks on Lk 4^{9}: 'It is impossible to determine what this means.' T. W. Davies (he is the author of the article in the *D.B.*) mentions first the Hebrew words, for which πτερύγιον is used. Then he says: 'The part meant was well known, as the use of the article τὸ (πτερύγιον) shows; *but the word is used in this connexion only*, and we have no means of definitely fixing its connotation.'

Strange that he too, like all the commentaries which I have had occasion to consult, omits to quote the very passage of the O.T. which gives a clue, namely, Dn 9^{27}, על כנף שקוצים משומם; Theodotion, ἕως πτερυγίου ἀπὸ ἀφανισμοῦ. It is true the passage is obscure, as the Dictionary of Brown-Driver-Briggs remarks; but there can be no doubt that it speaks of the temple and of a special part of it, where 'the abomination of desolation' is to stand; according to my conviction of the same spot, which is meant in the N.T. A reference to Dn 9^{27} must be added in all com-

mentaries and all editions of the N.T. on the margin of Mt 9^5, Lk 4^9. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

'Generation of Vipers.'

IT has been asked why John and Jesus use the expression γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, 'generation (R.V. "offspring") of vipers,' and not only 'ye vipers.' Plummer (Lk 3^7) says: it indicates another parentage than that of Abraham (Jn 8^{44}), and is perhaps purposely used in opposition to their trust in their descent. Th. Zahn (in Mt 3^7) reminds us of the fact, that Pharisaism was *hereditary* in the families. All these thoughts are unnecessary and contrary to Biblical Greek. It is true, ἔχιδνα occurs but once in Aquila (Is 59^5); but compare the Septuagint:

Is 11^8, ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐκγόνων ἀσπίδων;
14^{29}, ἐκ σπέρματος ὄφεως ἐξελεύσεται ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων;
30^6, ἀσπίδες καὶ ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων

In Hebrew there is nothing at all to correspond to ἔκγονα. Of special interest is 30^6, λέων καὶ σκύμνος λέοντος καὶ ἀσπίδες καὶ ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων compared with לביא ולישׁ אפעה ושׂרף מעופף. Every reader of the Greek must combine ἀσπίδες καὶ ἔκγονα ἀσπίδων; in Hebrew two different kinds of serpents are named. Still farer than the suggestions of Plummer and Zahn are those of the Fathers, referring to the fable of the Physiologus, that the viper comes to light by killing its parent; thus already Chrysostom. The sense of the expression is: you are not ordinary serpents, but venomous vipers. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Alpha and Omega.

THE first page of *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* is to be praised for a good observation, and to be blamed for a wrong conclusion drawn from it.

W. O. E. Oesterley, treating of A *and* Ω, justly says:

> 'It is noticeable that wherever the expression occurs in the Apocalypse it is written τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὦ, *i.e.* the first letter is written out in full, while the second is represented only by its sign. There must have been some reason for this.'

Certainly, but the way in which Oesterley tries to account for it will scarcely recommend itself.

The reason is simply that *the name O mega was at that time not yet in use, still less as one word Omega*, and it is strange that the Revisers, who were so careful, did not call attention to this fact, at least in the margin. Neither does any of the articles in the encyclopædias.

Oesterley is further wrong in writing Ὦ instead of Ὦ, and not correct to say that in the vast majority of instances (certainly in *all* the earliest) the symbol was written Aω, *i.e.* an *uncial* Alpha and a *cursive* Omega! The form of the last letter, which he calls 'cursive,' is just that which is generally used in our *uncial* MSS. On the history of the names of the letters of the Greek Alphabet, see K. E. A. Schmidt, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grammatik des Griechischen und Lateinischen*, Halle, 1859, pp. 49–77. For the times of Plato, we have his own testimony (*Cratylus*, 393 D): ὥσπερ τῶν στοιχείων οἶσθα ὅτι ὀνόματα λέγομεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα, πλὴν τεττάρων, τοῦ τε ε καὶ του υ καὶ τοῦ ο καὶ τοῦ ω, τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις φωνήεσι τε καὶ ἀφώνοις οἶσθα ὅτι περιτιθέντες ἄλλα γράμματα λέγομεν, ὀνόματα ποιοῦντες. I do not know the exact time of the first occurrence of *Omega* and *Omicron*, as I have not Schmidt's book at hand; but even Jerome wrote, O *brevis*, O *extensa* (not *parva* and *magna*); perhaps some reader of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES will supply this contribution to the history of the ABC to be found in the Bible.

P.S.—I am sorry that Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie* is not at my disposal. Leclercq and Cabrol deal there in vol. i. 1–25 with AΩ; in § ix. with ΑΩ *dans la Liturgie*. In the Celtic hymn, 'Sancti, venite, Christi corpus sumite,' which is preserved in the Antiphonar of Bangor (680–691 A.D.), the last verse runs:

'Alpha et omega
ipse Christus Dominus,
Venit, venturus
iudicare homines.'

But in one MS. (Cod. Ambrosian. C 5 inf.) the first line is written:

Alfa et ω.

Perhaps this is one of the earliest examples of the use of the word *omega* in the West.

Is there nothing to be found in Murray? The accurate J. A. Bengel already said: 'Ω, non ω μέγα hoc loco legere et pronunciare debemus. nam ω μέγα opponitur ο μικρῷ. ω, tamquam ultima alphabeti Graeci litera, opponitur τῷ alpha. Graece scripsit Johannes.' And even before Bengel, Hugo Grotius, †1645. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

New Biographies.

At the age of eighty-three Mrs. J. L. Story has published the first volume of her autobiography. *Early Reminiscences* she calls the book (Maclehose; 10s. 6d. net). How many more volumes she intends to write, we are not quite sure; she seems to speak of two or three; this one carries her story down no further than the year 1860.

Now it is a wonderful book for any woman of any age to write; for a woman of eighty-three to write it is a world's wonder, for there is none of the mere garrulity of old age; the memory seems sharp, the words ring with decision, the stories are told concisely. There are plenty of stories, but that is no mark of senility; and even if on occasion Mrs. Story's recollection is at fault, a slip in a name or the like (she calls Dr. Keith of St. Cyrus, Dr. *Thomas* Keith, and gives the title of his great book 'Prophecies on the Jews,' which just misses the right title and no more), these trifling things, we say, will easily be forgiven.

Speaking of Dr. Keith recalls an incident which she tells very well: 'On one occasion he paid me a compliment which I have ever since felt to be the highest I ever received. One evening I had sung to him several of his best loved songs; on bidding me good-night, he took my two hands in his, and in quite broken accents said to me, "Good-bye, my dear young lady. I have to thank you for much pleasure which you have given to a lonely old man. We may never meet again in this world: and my parting wish for you is that I may one day hear that beautiful voice among the angels of Heaven!" I have had many pretty things said to me since then, but never has anything entered into my heart and remained there as has that touching speech of old Dr. Keith.'

Mr. Andrew Elliot of Edinburgh has published in a handsome form the reminiscences of the Rev. Robert Henderson, under the title of *Ninety Years in the Master's Service*. The book is well written, much better written than the reminiscences of Bishop Boyd Carpenter, which we have been reading. And the author had a varied enough experience to relieve the telling of it of all dullness. A considerable part of the volume is occupied with an account of Mr. Henderson's ministry in Australia, where he spent fifteen busy years.

The volume of *Letters of George Borrow* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net) has claims on our attention more than one. It tells us of the work done by the Bible Society in Russia and in Spain, a work accomplished through much tribulation. It describes Spain itself; there is a memorable account of Seville, beginning on page 117. It reminds us that we must be patient with the slow death of the papacy. 'And now,' says George Borrow, writing to the Secretary of the Bible Society, 'and now I have something to tell you which I think will surprise you, and which, strange as it may sound, is nevertheless true. The authority of the Pope in this country is in so very feeble and precarious a situation, that little more than a breath is required to destroy it, and I am almost confident that in less than a year it will be disowned. I am doing whatever I can in Madrid to prepare the way for an event so desirable.' The letter was written on the 20th of April 1836.

But the chief claim which the book has on our attention is that the writer of the letters is George Borrow. Not all the intimacy of his own writings has brought him so near to us as these letters. And yet he is as far away from us as ever. The intimacy is an intimacy that we can relish but not presume upon. He is still, and even more than ever, something of the irresponsible Ariel, his intense earnestness taking nothing away from his irresponsibility. The book has been admirably edited by Mr. T. H. Darlow.

When Dr. M'Laren of Manchester began his ministry he was much struck with the way in which two sides of a subject were presented in Scripture, and he frequently preached upon the one side of it in the morning, and upon the other side of it in the evening. 'For example, *Morning*, the necessity of companionship—"It is not good for man to be alone." *Evening*, the advantages of solitude—"I was left alone, and saw this great vision." *Morning*, the co-operation of nature with man—"The stones of the field shall help him." *Evening*, nature's antagonism to man—"The stars

in their courses fought against Sisera." *Morning*, the wonders of creation—"He telleth the number of the stars, he calleth them all by their names." *Evening*, the miracles of grace—"He healeth the broken in heart, and bindeth up their wounds."'

This and many other things that are interesting to the preacher and to Dr. M'Laren's friends will be found in his Life—*Dr. M'Laren of Manchester*, by E. T. M'Laren (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is called by its author a sketch, but it is quite sufficient to give us an idea of the man he was and of the work he did. And it will be read by ten persons where only one would have read one of the great lumbering biographies that are so fashionable.

Among the biographies of the month, you will find a small volume entitled *The Life of Dr. Arthur Jackson of Manchuria* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net). The writer is Rev. A. J. Costain, M.A. It is a record of a short life; but if it had been longer no record of it might ever have been written, for it was the occasion that brought out the hero. Dr. Jackson went out to Manchuria as a missionary of the United Free Church of Scotland; then the plague came, and Dr. Jackson had his chance. Did his death stay the plague? Perhaps his name may be found in after days in the Acta Sanctorum, and there it will be said that it did, and said truly.

When Mr. Frederic Harrison writes he writes to be read. You may dissent from what he says, or at any rate from his attitude; but you read him to the end. The clear, vigorous simplicity of the style is wonderful. His message, it appears, has passed away, but his books will live. So when he gives us his autobiography, although he gives it in two large volumes, we receive it with joy. It will furnish a few hours' good reading, not without some profit, certainly with much pleasure.

The pleasure is greater than even the anticipation. Men and women of the last half-century pass before us and nearly always in a new light; those we have most admired perhaps in a light that is not quite pleasant; but, to make up for it, those we have admired less with a light thrown on them that is altogether acceptable and gratifying. There is George Henry Lewes, for example. 'The many excellent qualities and the brilliant intelligence of George H. Lewes were not perhaps always recognized, owing to his vagrant breeding and a somewhat effervescent manner. A philosopher who had lived a boisterous life in Bohemia, a man of science and a metaphysician who never quite ceased to be the versatile journalist, the *Graeculus esuriens* who at last found himself the host of princesses and nobles—was a compound character that too few justly honoured. But his beautiful devotion to George Eliot, and his loyal submission to her least wish or reproof, was a noble point in his character. In not a few things he was intellectually her superior. She learned much from him. He gave her real assistance; and it would have been well if he could have inspired her with a dose of the rattling devil within him. I believe that his services to the thought of his time will one day be more valued than they are to-day. And amongst these services I can never forget that he was the first writer in England to understand the new era which dates from Auguste Comte, and he was the first in England who sought to popularize the Positivist scheme of thought.'

On the whole the estimates are genial. Again and again Mr. Harrison refers us for the other side of the picture to other writings of his. 'I have had my say about Matthew Arnold on things wherein we differed, and I need only now speak of the many points whereon we heartily agreed. As a poet no writer of the Victorian Age had the same general intellectual culture or followed a muse more refined and elevated. Such thoughtful meditations could not command great popular success; and his ear for melody was too uncertain, or his leisure for continuous poetic achievement was too hampered, to allow him to leave us such poems as he might have given to the thoughtful world if he had led a poet's life. But he was essentially the critic—the arbiter of a somewhat silver age in literature—the mentor of a society wherein he never could forget that he was the son of a great Churchman and the associate of great magnates. He had not the moral courage of Dr. Johnson, nor the intellectual courage of John Stuart Mill. Whether he was criticising poetry, manners, or the Bible, one imagined him writing from the library of the Athenæum Club. His theological disquisitions were a curious mixture of intellectual audacity and social orthodoxy. As I told him, he tossed about his sceptical

epigrams and his risky *bons mots* like a free-thinking Abbé at Voltaire's supper-parties. His was the type of religion which will never consent to bear a label. But Oxford never bred a more typical scholar, nor had London society, clubland, or country-houses any more welcome guest or more fascinating companion.'

But the book is best on Mr. Frederic Harrison himself. There is no needless self-revelation, and there is no silly self-exaltation. But here is a man who was led in early youth to adopt a system of philosophy which claimed to be a religion, and who, having adopted it, felt bound to stick to it right through his life. If it had been otherwise at that early turning-point how different it might have been all through.

The title of the book is *Biographic Memoirs* (Macmillan; 2 vols., 30s. net).

We are always ready for another life of Luther. For the man was many-sided as well as momentous, and no one has yet altogether compassed him. We are always ready for another life, provided it is in sympathy. The day is not even yet past for denouncing Luther, as has been painfully evident lately. But a life of Luther at this time of day by an enemy would be a monstrosity, and we want none of it.

The latest life of Luther has been written by Professor McGiffert of Union Theological Seminary, New York. Its title is *Martin Luther: The Man and his Work* (Fisher Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). It is a life pure and simple. The mistake is not made of writing a history of the Reformation under the pretence of writing a life of Luther. And Professor McGiffert is in sympathy. Every effort evidently has been made to ascertain the truth, and there is nothing whatever in the way of unsupported denunciation of the enemy. Yet there is no mistaking the fact that there is an enemy, and that that enemy is the Pope and nearly all he stands for. Luther is never patronizingly told that he ought to have been more complacent. Professor McGiffert realizes that the time had unmistakably come not for the *suaviter in modo* of Erasmus, but for the *fortiter in re* of Luther.

Professor McGiffert is in sympathy with the work Luther did, and with the man himself. But the pleasantest picture he draws is that of Luther's wife, and he seems to have spent some time upon it. Let us thank him for that. Katharine von Bora is not always appreciated even in Protestant lives of Luther. Dr. McGiffert does not deny that she was a somewhat masterful person with a mind and will of her own. But he sees that that mind and that will were given to serve the interests of her husband. With a less masterful person as his wife, Luther would have been less happy than he was, and he would have accomplished less. The book is well written throughout and it is well illustrated.

'Let us praise great men,' said the son of Sirach, and forthwith he found quite a number of great men worth praising. There are many great men left still to praise, and one of them is Sir Humphrey Gilbert. The praise of Sir Humphrey comes to us in the form of a substantial Life, and all the way from Newfoundland. It might have been expected that *The Life of Sir Humphrey Gilbert, England's First Empire Builder* (Constable; 12s. 6d. net), would have been written by the Rev. Walter Raleigh Gilbert of the Priory, Bodmin, Cornwall, who is a direct lineal descendant of Sir Humphrey, and has in his charge the family records and papers; but he did the next best thing to that in permitting Mr. William Gilbert Gosling to examine these records and papers, and thus put it in his power to write a life of Sir Humphrey Gilbert that is not only worthy of its subject, but is quite fit to take a place among the very best historical biographies of our time.

Why is Sir Humphrey so little known now? Why is it that he has been so completely eclipsed by the fame of Sir Walter Raleigh? In some notable respects they were very much alike. Both were failures, and both failed simply because they were a generation ahead of their time. The art of colonization, says our author, was unknown in England, and it took a generation of attempts and failures before the secret of success was learned. For the nation was not yet ready for it, and those that embarked upon it did so half-heartedly.

Bishop Boyd Carpenter has written his autobiography. He does not give his book that title, and he is right. It is not dignified enough for so great a word. He has called it *Some Pages of my Life* (Williams & Norgate; 15s. net). Whether

he deliberately determined to write as easily as a book could be written, or whether this is simply the natural way in which Bishop Boyd Carpenter now writes, we do not know; but here it is without a sentence that has been carefully formed, without a paragraph that can give a good reason for its separate existence. It seems that Bishop Boyd Carpenter sat down to write as he would sit down to talk, and wrote and wrote just as he might talk and talk, the only difference being that here is a book at the end of the writing, while at the end of the talking there would have been nothing but a handshake and off to bed.

Yet he has the materials; he knew Browning and Tennyson, and he knew Queen Victoria most intimately. He could have written a book about Queen Victoria alone. Again we ask, Did he deliberately determine not to write such a book? We do not say that he has accomplished nothing. He has given us a picture of the Queen that is more lifelike, and for that matter more attractive, than anything that we have elsewhere read; and again we wonder, Did he deliberately determine to do that, sacrificing his own reputation as a writer for this purpose? Nothing could be more aimless than his chapter on preaching, and yet he says things that remain. His own example is memorable. He has been an extempore preacher, as it is called, from the beginning, and he recommends extempore preaching. The puzzling thing is that Bishop Boyd Carpenter has already published a book on preaching, and it is a book, whereas the chapter here is just talk, and yet it is more memorable than the book.

There are anecdotes and experiences, but not one of them is well told; and yet here once more we wonder whether he deliberately gave the anecdote and left the telling of it alone. It is a puzzling book and even provoking, but we are almost sure to find ourselves reading it again.

New Poetry.

The poets of America are many, and you cannot always call them minor. If you do, where are the major poets to-day? Sara Teasdale is an American poet. Her latest book is *Helen of Troy, and Other Poems* (Putnam; 5s. net). She is most at home in the intimacies of the lover and the loved, but here is a naked piece of fear, the fear of death, without shame or covering:

FEAR.

I am afraid, oh I am so afraid!
The cold black fear is clutching me to-night
As long ago when they would take the light
And leave the little child who would have prayed,
Frozen and sleepless at the thought of death.
My heart that beats too fast will rest too soon;
I shall not know if it be night or noon—
Yet shall I struggle in the dark for breath?
Will no one fight the Terror for my sake,
The heavy darkness that no dawn will break?
How can they leave me in that dark alone,
Who loved the joy of light and warmth so much,
And thrilled so with the sense of sound and touch—
How can they shut me underneath a stone?

Here is another poem on the fear of death. It is not quite so bare and stark. Perhaps it is more poetical. The author is Edmund Gosse. Edmund Gosse has collected his poems, the poems of something like forty years, and greatly will his readers be pleased with the simplicity and the beauty of the volume in which they have been gathered together. The title is *The Collected Poems of Edmund Gosse* (Heinemann; 5s. net). They need no criticism or commendation. Let us simply quote for memory's sake this poem on the fear of death:

THE FEAR OF DEATH.

Beneath her window in the cool, calm night
I stood, and made as though I would have sung,
Being full of life, and confident and young,
And dreaming only of young love's delight;
Then suddenly I saw the gloom divide,
And gliding from the darkest cypress-tree
Death came, white-boned, and snatcht my lute from me,
And sat himself, grimacing, by my side.
Just then, as when the golden moon looks down
On starless waters from a stony sky,
My love's fair face shone out above on high;
Whereat I, fearing nothing of Death's frown,
Turned smiling to salute her lovely head,
And when I turned again, lo! Death had fled!

Another American poet is May Byron. She has chosen *The Wind on the Heath* as the title of her volume of ballads and lyrics (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It is an appropriate title. There are memories in her heart that awaken memories in ours, sometimes disturbing, always fitful and indistinct. There are also hopes for the future which are borne on the wind, as this hope:

THE HOUSEHOLD.

Sometimes in dreams I see
The houses of the Lord, not built with hands:
Each mansion that in God's own city stands,
Empty and waiting,
Lifts up its everlasting doors for me.

And some of these are ceiled
With flaming swords, as for some hero's home:
And some for weary souls that long did roam
Are soft be-cushioned:
And some are set in green and lilied field.

But fairest of them all
Are those great houses whereout laughing eyes
From nursery windows look, and sounds arise
Of little voices,
Holding within eternal festival;

And flying glimpses gleam
Of nutbrown locks, of golden curly head,
Of innocent floweret faces, hands outspread
In joyous welcome,
And little feet that dance across my dream.

And rounded rosy limbs
Through cloudy curtains glance and disappear;
And tiny songs, and prattle sweet to hear,
And lovely laughter,
Ringing softly out, and baby mirth o'er-brims.

And there at last I know
The barren woman shall keep house some day,
A joyful mother of children: and shall say,
Sobbing with gladness,
'Past all my hopes, why hast thou blessed me so?'

Is it the rebellion of interpretation, or is it the pressure of hard experience that makes a man write on Lot's wife, and write in this way?

LOT'S WIFE.

Whene'er the whirl of toil does cease
And those rare moments come, when peace
Allows the soul itself to know
And feel of life more than its flow,
Never what is, nor what will be,
But what has been, has power o'er me;
How joyously my memory bends
To former days and old-time friends!
With pity oft I've thought, Lot's wife,
Who feared to leave the familiar life,
And shrank to tread on unknown ways,
Deserved not punishment but praise.
Did God still punish alike her fault,
I had been long since a pillar of salt!

Mr. Stewart A. Robertson is the writer. The poem will be found in his volume entitled *Two Voices*, a volume which contains verses both in Scots and in English (Maclehose; 4s. net).

Mr. Charles Robert Smith, who has published a volume of *Poems* (Fifield; 3s. 6d. net), is not always master of his metre. He has mind enough. Thoughts come to him in plenty, and they are poetical thoughts. But his ear does not seem able always to keep pace. Here, however, is a song that is melodious enough:

SONG.

Look, Love, how from the crimson West
The sun's bright glories fade!
The whisp'ring zephyrs tell of rest
In ev'ry deep'ning shade.
Pray God that ev'ry aching breast
This night in peace be laid.

Look how yon absent orb's great love
Lights up his sister's face.
How modestly she floats above
And shines there in his place!
Pray that we, too, through life may move
Full of reflected grace.

Heaven's star eyes now are opening wide:
Hushed is the worldy din;
For Night has spread her cloak to hide
Another day of sin.
God keep thee ever by my side
And make us pure within.

A much more beautiful and much better volume under the same simple title of *Poems* has been written by Mr. Charles Granville, and published by Messrs. Stephen, Swift, & Co. Here is imagination and melody both. Take the poem called 'Forgive.'

If God would only send
But just a breath, when in the grave I lie,
And you a listening ear would downward bend
Upon the greening mound, as you pass by;
Then should one fervent prayer my soul relieve:
'Forgive, forgive!'

And if you do not heed
What that last whisper unto you shall say,
I yet will follow, spirit-wise, and plead
Through the night watches and the dreary day,
Till my too-burdened soul doth find reprieve
And you forgive.

For Christmas and the New Year.

Messrs. Blackie & Sons have sent out six volumes of Christmas presents or prizes which will not yield in handsomeness to any volume of the season. There are three for girls and three for boys. Take the girls' books first.

Fair Noreen (6s.) has been written by Rosa Mulholland (Lady Gilbert). It is described as the story of a girl of character, and to the description of that girl of character—to her sayings, her doings, and herself—Lady Gilbert has given her whole strength. Of the rest of the persons in the book the most attractive is Lord Gytrash, and the least is Mrs. Emmeline Turbary. Between these two poles the rest range in various degrees of ordinariness. But the book is more than a picture gallery. It is a genuine story, and it ends happily, as all children's books ought to do.

Miss Bessie Marchant's *A Girl of Distinction* (5s.) strikes a deeper note. The heroine is a heroine, not merely a clever and attractive girl, and one who can face the odds of life without flinching. It is a somewhat long drawn out agony; but not for the reader. The story, indeed, is intensely absorbing right to the end, until the shadows flee and the darkness melts away.

The Ferry House Girls (3s. 6d.), also by Miss Marchant, is an Australian story. It is not altogether attractive, but the two girls have individuality; they even retain much grace in spite of their somewhat rough surroundings. It is, however, a story that is unmistakably successful, the mystery being retained to the end.

Of the three boys' books the largest has been written by our old friend Captain Brereton. Captain Brereton goes everywhere preaching his gospel. A gospel of heroism and hardship it always is. This time he goes to the Panama Canal. The negro conversation is occasionally somewhat disconcerting. Perhaps it is just as well that it is not always intelligible. But there is certainly life in abundance throughout. The title of the book is *The Hero of Panama* (6s.).

Mr. Harry Collingwood has written a romance of the old British navy. Its title is *A Middy of the King* (5s.). There is a fine mixture of history and imagination; on the whole the imagination has it. The *Wasp* is a wonderful vessel, and its end is wonderful.

In *The Quest of the Golden Hope*, by Mr. Percy F. Westerman (2s. 6d.), we have another story of seventeenth-century adventure, and again it is more by sea than by land. There is much enterprise and a little love-making; and it is pleasant to know that love's labour is not lost.

The story of the Acts of the Apostles has been told in language suitable to the young by S. B. Macy. The language is not infantile—the 'children' to whom it is addressed must be able to read words of more than one syllable—but it is simple and concrete. There are also illustrations, full-page illustrations of scenes and of incidents, and there are twenty-one poems of considerable length. All this is found in a book of large size and attractive binding, entitled *The Master Builders* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net).

From the Pilgrim Press there comes a beautiful story based on the visit of the Magi, called *Three Little Wise Men and the Star* (1s. net). The author is W. E. Cule; the illustrations are by Florence Meyerheim.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published *The Herald of Mercy Annual*. We notice a larger range of subject, but the essential note is always the same.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott send also *The Christian Series of Motto Cards for 1912*. The colouring is bright, to be attractive at a distance.

Notice also two books and a booklet issued by

Messrs. Morgan & Scott. The booklet is for the children, written by Lettice Bell, and called *The Quest* (1s. net). The books are (1) *The Tabernacle and its Teaching*, by the Rev. Wilfred M. Hopkins (3s. 6d. net), wherein the tabernacle and all its appurtenances are made types of those things which we have seen and heard in the New Testament, and thereafter lessons for this present evil time; (2) a book of *Twilight Tales about Boys and Girls*, by Forbes Jackson, M.A. (2s. 6d. net), a book of marvellous winsomeness, the work of more than a children's friend—a children's genius.

A dainty little book for Christmas giving is a selection from the writings of the Bishop of London called *Messages of To-day* (Wells Gardner; 1s. net).

Messrs. Wells Gardner have published the volume for 1912 of *Chatterbox* (3s.) and *The Prize* (1s. 6d.). *The Prize* is the smaller book, but it is written for bigger boys and girls. It has more competition to fight against. But neither *Chatterbox* nor *The Prize* need fear competition if they can make progress in coloured illustration in the future as they have made it in the past.

A centenary memorial volume of *Sayings of John Bright* has been edited by Cecil Wedmore (Headley Brothers; 6d. net). It is prepared for Christmas presentation.

From Mr. Meyer at the Memorial Hall, E.C., you may obtain some little books that will take the place of the Christmas card if you want to do away with that. They contain an evangelical message, each written by a scholar—Dr. Horton, Mr. Bisseker, Mr. Gillie, or Mr. Meyer himself.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. E. J. Roberts, Melbourne, Derby, and the Rev. R. P. Butterfield, B.A., Rozelle, Ceylon.

Illustrations for the Great Text for February must be received by the 1st of January. The text is Is 28^{16}.

The Great Text for March is Ro 15^{4}—'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.' A copy of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for April is Is 30^{15}—'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.' A copy of Professor Clarke's *The Ideal of Jesus*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for May is Is 40^{6-8}—'The voice of one saying, Cry. And one said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our Lord shall stand for ever.' A copy of Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, or Oswald Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for June is Is $53^{1.\ 2}$—'Who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.' A copy of Agnew's *Life's Christ Places*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'And he closed the book; and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fastened on him.'

'He closed the book.' It was a very simple and obvious thing to do. Every Sabbath day the reader of the prophets in the synagogue at Nazareth, when he had come to the end of his reading, closed the book. Yes; but look again, and perhaps you shall see beneath the obvious, the wonderful; and beneath the customary, the unique. He closed the book. Something happened in the synagogue at Nazareth that day that had never happened before. The book had been closed before, but never like that. Never with such divine reasons, such wealth of suggestion, such assumption of authority.

The sermon is by the Rev. Percy C. Ainsworth. Three, if not four, volumes of sermons by this preacher have been published, although he was taken away in the earliest years of manhood. And every succeeding volume makes the first surprise greater. 'The more I think,' said Jeffrey, when he received Macaulay's first essay for the *Edinburgh Review*, 'the more I think, the less I can conceive where you picked up that style.' This young man's style is as perfect for his purpose as Macaulay's was for his. And the style is but one thing. The more we think, the less we can conceive where he picked up his insight into the mind of Christ, and his ability to make the mind of Christ a key to open the treasures of wisdom and knowledge that are found in Scripture. The new book is called *A Thornless World* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). The title of the second sermon is, 'He closed the Book.'

Why did He close the book? Because He is greater than the book. The book was the shadow; He was the reality. The book was the echo; He was the voice. The book was the forecast; He was the fulfilment. The book was the teaching; He was the Teacher. You can in some measure realize the tremendous significance of that simple act of closing the book, when you understand that the sad strange story of the Jewish people, from that day unto this present time, turns on their inability to interpret it.

He closed the book and made it a greater book. It is a greater book now than when He closed it—far greater. Its prophecy is illuminated by its history. Instead of being but a whisper of that which shall be, it is now also a story of that which hath been and now is. We can read the meaning of long centuries of sacrifice, and interpret the dim light of all religious altar-fires, in three hours of anguish on Calvary. It is a larger book now, a deeper book, a holier book. But still He is greater than the book. Still there ever comes to

men, if they will receive it, the voice that is mightier than the voice of the book, the message that is warmer and more vital than the message of the book. It is the living grace of the closed book.

He closed the book, not because the reading of it was done, but that He might continue to read it. We read one portion at the beginning of the day, and again another portion at the end of it, and we say, 'I wish I had more time to read my Bible.' But we close it that we may go on reading it. We have all the day to read our Bible. Sometimes the only way to read it is to close it. We come to a point where it seems to have no more to teach us. It has said its last word. We pore over it, and ponder it, and analyze it, but we never get any further with it. Then the secret of understanding is to close the book. We thank God for an open Bible. Let us thank God for a Bible we can close. Let us thank God for the truth that is not prisoned in the pages of a book, but that dwells in human life.

He closed the book. He closed it that He might open it. He laid it aside for a moment that they might learn what it meant. While it was open before their eyes, and they were beholding nothing beside it or beyond it, they could not understand it. He closed the book in order that they might carry its profound messages into the setting of their daily lives. 'I wish,' says some one, 'that I could read the Bible in the original.' It is a laudable wish. It is, indeed, the only way in which any man can understand the Bible. But what is the original? Not Hebrew or Greek. There is one original language in which the Old and New Testaments are written; it is the language of human experience. Hebrew is useful; Greek is still more useful; but life is essential. The deep original language of the human heart in its loves and its clingings; the deep original language of the human spirit in its aspirations and self-consciousness; the language of hope and love, sorrow and need, endeavour and patience and victory—that is the original language of the Bible.

'Like as a father pitieth his children.' A man may read those words in the beautiful Hebrew, or in the nameless grace of our Authorized Version. But the deepest wealth and comfort of that immortal simile is given to him at the cradle of his own little child.

'Cast thy burden upon the Lord, and he shall sustain thee.' If the great Biblical scholar can tell us anything about that promise that is worth telling, it is not because he knows the force and history of every Hebrew root in it; it is because he knows what it is to lean a tired heart on the tireless help of the Eternal Love. The authority on this text is not the man with the best education; it is the man with the biggest burden and the simplest faith. He closed the book that they might learn to read it in the original.

Professor Josiah Royce has published a volume of Essays. The first essay is the Phi Beta Kappa Oration delivered at Harvard University in June 1911. It is an appreciation of the work of the late William James, and, being the first essay, it gives the book its title: *William James, and other Essays on the Philosophy of Life* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net).

Now Professor Royce did not always approve of Professor James. That form of philosophy called Pragmatism with which the name of Professor James will always be associated has never been quite palatable to him. Nevertheless he does not hesitate to say that 'the representative American philosophers are now three, and only three—Edwards, Emerson, James.'

But it is not the essay on William James that we wish at present to speak about. The other essays in the volume are on 'Loyalty and Insight,' 'What is vital in Christianity?', 'The Problem of Truth in the Light of Recent Discussion,' and 'Immortality.' The essay we wish to speak about is the third. Its title is 'What is vital in Christianity?'

Nothing is more widely, or indeed more anxiously, sought for at present than an answer to that question. We have passed through a long period of criticism—criticism of the Bible, criticism of Christ, criticism of Christianity. And criticism causes surrender. Upon its demands we have had to give up this, we have had to give up that, till now at the end of it, if it is the end, we seem to be reduced to the barest elements of belief. We have no longer any stomach for a struggle about theories of the Atonement, or a dispute over the exact angle at which the two natures of Christ come together; we are driven to ask if there is anything in the religion which we profess that gives it eternal significance. In the words of Professor Royce, we now put the question anxiously: 'What is vital in Christianity?'

Professor Royce answers his question by splitting it up into three questions. He asks first, What are we to understand by 'vital'? What is it in a religion, in any religion, that must be called vital, as distinguished from that which is not vital? When he has answered that, he turns to Christianity, and he asks next, What do we find in this particular religion which we call Christianity that is vital to it? What is that without which it would not be Christianity? And then, when he has answered these two questions, he briefly asks a third, What is the permanent value, and in particular what is the value for us to-day, of that thing or those things which in Christianity we are compelled to call vital?

The first question is, What do we mean by vital as applied to the contents of a religion? Vital means more than living; it means necessary to life. That is vital for a living organism, without which the organism cannot live. Breathing is vital for us all. Now, when we turn to religion, we notice that it is made up of practices or ideas, or both. It is made up of practices such as prayers, ceremonies, festivals, rituals, and other observances. Or it is made up of ideas—ideas about God or spirits, or the like. Or it is made up of religious ideas and religious practices combined. So, when we come to ask what is vital about a religion, our first question is, Whether are the practices or the ideas of a religion more vital? Or, in other words, if on the one hand we let the religious practices go, or on the other hand let go the religious ideas, do we still retain the religion?

Now, in the primitive religions it is practice that prevails. And not only in the primitive religions, but also with the simple-minded followers of all religions. Professor Royce goes even so far as to say that in the world at large, including both the civilized and the uncivilized, the followers of a religion are, in general, people who accept as binding the practices of that religion. They may not think about the meaning of these practices at all. Or, if they do, they may interpret them in all sorts of different ways. That which makes them followers of the particular religion is that they say its prayers, they keep its festivals,—in short, perform its practices.

This leads Professor Royce to make the startling suggestion that perhaps the origin of all religion is to be found in practice. 'Men come to believe as they do,' he says, 'regarding the nature of some supernatural being, largely in consequence of the fact that they have first come to follow some course of conduct, not for any conscious reason at all, but merely from some instinctive tendency which by accident has determined this or that special expression. When the men come to observe this custom of theirs, and to consider why they act thus, some special religious belief often arises as a sort of secondary explanation of their practice.'

Suppose men were pigeons. 'The pigeons in our college yard cluster about the benevolent student or visitor who feeds them. This clustering is the result of instinct and of their training in seeking food. The pigeons presumably have no conscious ideas or theories about the true nature of the man who feeds them. Of course, they are somehow aware of his presence and of what he

does, but they surely have only the most rudimentary and indefinite germs of ideas about what he is. But if the pigeons were to come to consciousness somewhat after the fashion of primitive men, very probably they would regard this way of getting food as a sort of religious function and would begin to worship the visitor as a kind of god.'

We need not follow Professor ROYCE with his pigeon parable further. His conclusion is that everywhere practice has preceded idea. But that does not prove that idea is more vital than practice. Nor does it prove that when the practices of a religion are interpreted, the interpretation may remain while the practices fall away. All that Professor ROYCE seems to have accomplished yet is to show that, since practices precede ideas, it is probable that that religion which demands belief or faith is higher and more permanent than that which rests content with outward observance.

But surely—Professor ROYCE hears our impatient 'surely.' But surely, we say, a religion that is to last must contain both creed and conduct. Whether in the evolution of religion, if religion is the subject of evolution, conduct or creed came first does not seem to be a matter of what you call 'vital' importance. Can a religion that is worth the name ever be an affair of practice apart from inner belief, or an affair of belief, however orthodox and elevated, apart from conduct and life? Professor ROYCE admits the reasonableness of our interruption. It is right, he says, that we should come at once to the highest religion. And in the highest religion what is vital is neither mere practice nor mere opinion. It is the union of the two. 'It is the reaction of *the whole spirit* in the presence of an experience of the highest realities of human life and of the universe.'

What have we now? We have the end of the first answer. The question was, What is that which must be called vital in a religion? The answer is, That is vital which brings together most harmoniously the best belief and the best practice. One man says the vital thing is, Believe in God. Another man says the vital thing is, Do good and sin not. Both answers are insufficient until they are united in one. In a word, that which is vital to the highest religion is the union of faith and works through a completed spirituality.

But what is a completed spirituality? The answer to that will be found in the answer to the second question.

Now, before he proceeds to answer the second question, Professor ROYCE has to remind us that what is vital in Christianity, if Christianity is permanently to retain its vitality at all in our modern world, must be defined primarily neither in terms of mere religious practice nor yet in terms of merely intellectual formulation, but in terms of that unity of will and intellect which may be expressed in the spiritual disposition of the whole man. He proceeds to ask, What is that spiritual disposition or spiritual attitude of the whole man which is essential to the Christian religion?

Two answers have been given. They differ from one another. They are finally irreconcilable.

The first answer is that the vital thing in Christianity is the shaping of the life of the Christian in accordance with the teaching of Christ. Grasp the spirit of Christ's own teaching, interpret life as He interpreted it, and live out this interpretation of life as completely as you can, imitating Him—then you are a Christian.

The other answer is that the vital thing about Christianity is to regard the mission and the life of Christ as an organic part of a divine plan for the salvation and redemption of man. It is necessary that the person of Christ should be viewed in its relation to God and the work of Christ as an entirely unique revelation and expression of God's will. Now the work of Christ culminated in His death. The cross is therefore the symbol of whatever is most vital in Christianity. In short,

according to this second answer, what is vital to Christianity is an acceptance of the two cardinal doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement. Only if these doctrines are accepted is it possible to interpret life in the essentially Christian way and to live out this interpretation.

At first sight, these answers seem to carry us back to the difference between practice and belief. But Professor Royce denies that they do this. The believer in the incarnation has no occasion, he says, to charge his opponent with degrading Christ to the level of a mere teacher of morals, and Christianity to a mere practice of good works. Nor has the man who accepts the sayings of Christ, and seeks to conform his life to them, any right to say that his opponent makes true religion depend upon the acceptance of certain metaphysical opinions regarding the superhuman nature of Christ. No; the opposition between these two views regarding what is vital in Christianity is an opposition that appears on the highest levels of the religious consciousness. Both view Christianity as a faith which gives sense to life, and also as a mode of life which is centred about a faith. Yet the two positions are opposed and irreconcilable. You may believe in the teaching of Christ and endeavour to conform to it, and you may also believe that He gave His life as a ransom for sin and uncleanness. But the question is, Which of these two views is vital to Christianity? They are not both vital. Christianity is essentially either a religion of redemption in the sense in which tradition has defined redemption, or else it is simply that religion of the love of God and the love of man which the sayings and the parables so richly illustrate.

Which of these things does Professor Royce himself believe to be essential? If Professor Royce were a theologian, we should probably expect him to say that Christianity is essentially a religion of redemption. But he is a philosopher. Nevertheless Professor Royce believes that Christianity is a religion of redemption.

'As a student of philosophy,' he says, 'coming in no partisan spirit, I must insist that this reduction of what is vital in Christianity to the so-called pure Gospel of Christ, as He preached it and as it is recorded in the body of the presumably authentic sayings and parables, is profoundly unsatisfactory.' He gives two reasons. For one thing, he says, Christ can hardly be supposed to have regarded His sayings as containing the whole of His message, or as embodying the whole of His mission. For, if He had so viewed the matter, the Messianic tragedy in which His life-work culminated would have been needless and unintelligible. For the rest, the doctrine that He taught is manifestly incomplete. It ever looks beyond itself for its completion.

Well, we are making progress. We have now reached this definite conclusion, that Christianity is a redemptive religion. Or, to use the words which Professor Royce himself uses at this stage, 'What is most vital to Christianity is contained in whatever is essential and permanent about the doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement.' Is this the end, then? No, the end is not yet.

For, you observe, Professor Royce does not say that what is most vital to Christianity consists in the doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement. He says that what is most vital to Christianity is contained in *whatever is essential and permanent* about the doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement. Now Professor Royce does not accept the doctrines of the incarnation and the atonement as they have been handed down from the beginning. What is essential and permanent in them is not the same to him as it has been to the Church. To put the difference into a sentence, Professor Royce does not believe in miracle.

How, then, does he understand the doctrine of the incarnation? He believes that it is not necessary to look upon the incarnation and the atonement as having been accomplished at a particular

time in the history of the world, or in the case of a particular person. He says that they ought to be viewed as timeless facts which never merely happened, but which in every age determine anew the relation of the faithful to God. And he holds, besides, that this view has been in existence, though not the prevailing view, throughout the history of the Church. Some of the mediæval mystics, for example, 'fully believing in their own view of their faith, and innocent of any modern doubts about miracles, were accustomed in their tracts and sermons always and directly to interpret every part of the gospel narrative, including the miracles, as the expression of a vast and timeless whole of spiritual facts, whereof the narratives are merely symbols.' He takes Meister ECKHART by way of example.

ECKHART begins as follows a sermon on the text, 'Who is he that is born king of the Jews?' (Mt 2^2): 'Mark you,' he says, 'mark you concerning this birth, where it takes place. I say, as I have often said: This eternal birth takes place in the soul, and takes place there precisely as it takes place in the eternal world,—no more, no less. This birth happens in the essence, in the very foundation of the soul.'

Again, ECKHART expounds in a sermon the statement that 'Christ came in the fulness of time'; that is, as people usually and literally interpret the matter, Christ came when the human race was historically prepared for His coming. But, says Professor ROYCE, Eckhart is careless concerning this historical and literal interpretation of the passage in question, although he doubtless also believes it. For him the true meaning of the passage is wholly spiritual. When, he asks in substance, is the day fulfilled? At the end of the day. When is a task fulfilled? When the task is over. When, therefore, is the fulness of time reached? Whenever a man is in his soul ready to be done with time; that is, when in contemplation he dwells only upon and in the eternal. Then alone, when the soul forgets time, and dwells upon God who is above time, then, and then only, does Christ really come.

Now at this point one is compelled to ask the question, Why cannot Professor ROYCE do as Meister ECKHART does? ECKHART believes in the timelessness of the incarnation and the atonement. So does Professor ROYCE. But ECKHART believes also, and first of all, that the incarnation and the atonement were first accomplished in the person of Christ and in a definite moment of time. It is that definite moment that gives it its timeless value and even its possibility for him. Why does not Professor ROYCE believe that the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us in the person of Jesus Christ, who then, when the literal time came, suffered for us, the Just for the unjust? Professor ROYCE cannot believe because he is a philosopher.

For it is not science, as we have so long and so awkwardly held, that says miracles are impossible; it is philosophy. Professor ROYCE is an idealist. He is an idealist of a peculiar quality. He believes that God is identical with the universe. So identical, that is to say, that we cannot even in thought separate the one from the other. In his own words, and they are words that are not without audacity: 'Like the Logos of the Fourth Gospel, this entire world is not only with God, but is God.'

There is no place for miracle, then. The distinction between the natural and the supernatural is abolished. All that is natural is supernatural, and all that is supernatural is natural. And so the incarnation takes place whenever any soul, be it the soul of Jesus or the soul of John, recognizes this present God and responds to the peace of His presence. And as for the atonement—the atonement depends upon the evil that is in the world.

The atonement depends upon the evil that is in the world? But how can there be evil in a world which is simply the embodiment of the life of God?

Professor Royce's answer is that the evil is there deliberately, as part of the Divine purpose. There is evil in the world in order that there may be suffering in the world. And there is suffering in the world in order that there may be atonement.

For it is only through atonement, through the sacrifice of self for others, that the incarnation can become complete, and the soul of man, of any man, Jesus or John, can enjoy the eternal relation of the soul to God.

Professor Royce sums up the whole matter in two theses: 'First, God wins perfection through expressing Himself in a finite life and triumphing over and through its very finitude. And secondly, Our sorrow is God's sorrow. God means to express Himself by winning us through the very triumph over evil to unity with the perfect life: and therefore our fulfilment, like our existence, is due to the sorrow and the triumph of God Himself. These two theses express, I believe, what is vital in Christianity.'

The Attitude of the Outspread Hands ('Orante') in Early Christian Literature and Art.

By Dr. D. Plooij, Tiel, Holland.

In the Dutch *Theologisch Tijdschrift* of September 1911, I have printed an article on the attitude of the 'Orante' in the Odes of Solomon. Asked to give my argument in English for scholars who do not read Dutch, I do so readily, especially as I have now an opportunity of treating the subject in full, and to correct some ambiguous expressions.

For me it is beyond doubt that Dr. Bernard, in his article on the Odes,[1] has shown the right way for explaining the Odes in calling them 'hymns of the baptized.' Some of his arguments may have been too weak, so as to make his position more uncertain than needed,—in the main point continued and careful study undoubtedly decides in favour of his hypothesis, as many new parallels prove. Of course, the enigma of the Odes is not yet solved with this, but the right way is shown, and that is the main point.

Dr. Bernard, however, seems not to have noticed a detail which, in my opinion, confirms his thesis so far as to prove positively *at least* that the Odes as we read them now in the Harrisian collection have been in *baptismal liturgical* use. I have in mind Ode 27 and Ode 42^{1-3}. The translation of these verses as given by Dr. Harris in his second edition of the Odes (p. 127 and p. 139) runs as follows:—

Ode 27.—(1) I stretched out my hands, and sanctified my Lord: (2) for the extension of my hands is His sign: (3) and my expansion is the upright tree (*or* cross).

Ode 42.—(1) I stretched out my hands, and approached my Lord: (2) for the stretching of my hands is His sign: (3) my expansion is the outspread tree which was set up on the way of the Righteous one.

The text of these verses is not in order, and, even after the emendations and corrections proposed by several scholars, there remain uncertainties, which I will not try here to remove, but the main point is quite clear and certain: the stretching out of the hands is a symbolic act signifying the cross of Christ, and in this act a confession of the Lord is expressed.

Now, Zahn already has pointed out the liturgical character of these verses. He says: 'Sie sind eine liturgische Formel von ausgesprochen christlichem Charakter, mit welcher der Sänger sich zu gottesdienstlichem Gebet anschickt.'[2] The liturgical character is certain, but that the act in itself is a prayer-act, as Zahn says, cannot be inferred from the verses quoted. The Odes mention the attitude of the outstretched hands in other places. Of these only 37^{1} may be called a prayer: (1) I stretched out my hands to my Lord: and to the Most High I raised my voice, (2) And I spake with the lips of my heart, and He heard me, etc. But neither in 21^{1}, nor in 35^{8}, where the same attitude

[1] *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, October 1910, pp. 1–30.

[2] *Neue kirchliche Zeitschr.* 1910, S. 694 f.

is mentioned, is there any trace that it is intended as an act accompanying a prayer.

The symbolic meaning of the prayer-act with outstretched hands is well known in ancient Christianity. Justin sees the cross in the outstretched hands of Moses when praying for the people during the battle against Amalek.[1] And this interpretation becomes traditional in ancient Christian exegesis.[2] Tertullian, in his treatise on prayer, says that Christians when praying raise their hands only moderately in harmony with the humility which suits us. And, says he, we do not only raise our hands, but we expand them too, symbolizing the passion of the Lord, and *so we make in our prayer a confession of Christ.*[3] Yea, the whole creation prays: when the birds rise to heaven, they expand the cross of their wings just as we expand our hands.[4] How real this thought was in early Christianity may be seen from Eusebius' narration of the persecutions in Palestine, where a young man, not yet twenty years of age, freed from his chains standing upright in the arena, spread out his hands in the form of a cross, and so remained absorbed in prayer while the wild beasts approached him.[5] So in this act confession of Christ in the midst of the enemies, and prayer are combined.

How widely this symbolic act spread over all Christendom is obvious, *e.g.*, from the fact that also in gnostic circles the symbolism was common. From Schmidt, *Kopt. Gnost. Schriften*, p. 336, Dr. Harris quotes: 'Die Ausbreitung seiner Hände ist die Offenbarung des Kreuzes.'

The quoted instances may suffice. They prove sufficiently that the symbolism of the cross in the outspread hands was common in early Christianity. The oldest instance, we may add, is from the Gospels. In Jn $21^{18ff.}$, the Saviour having restored Peter in his pastoral office, says: 'When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself . . . but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldst not.' And the Evangelist adds emphatically: 'This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God.'

So far the question may be esteemed to be beyond discussion. But hitherto prayer and symbolism of the cross have been identified too much, and this symbolism is believed to be only an accidental more or less arbitrary interpretation of the prayer-act, as if this attitude of prayer would be especially Christian even without this symbolism. But this supposition is erroneous: this attitude in prayer is not peculiar to Christianity. Von Sybel[6] already has laid stress on this, and has pointed out that the pagan prayer gesture was the same which Tertullian demands from his fellow-Christians. When Wilpert[7] explains Tertullian, *De Or.* c. 13, that Tertullian means to say: 'Hierdurch unterscheidet sich der betende Christ von dem betenden Heiden, welcher die Hände "nur erhebt" ohne sie "auszubreiten,"' he comes in conflict with what we know of the pagan attitude in prayer.

From what has been said, it follows that the symbolism of the cross as we find it in the Christian prayer-act is not necessarily expressed by it, but *secondarily combined with it.* In the Odes, however, we find the same attitude as is used in prayer and reproduced in ancient Christian art as 'orante,' but separated from any prayer, as an independent act denoting the cross of the Lord. So we have to look for an explanation independent of the interpretation as symbolic prayer-act.

Tertullian, in the quoted passage, says explicitly that in the attitude of the outspread hands as used in prayer, lies a symbolism of a confession of Christ and His cross; Ode 27 and 42^{1-3} show a liturgical character; Tert. *De Bapt.* c. 19: *passio domini* in qua *tingimur*, and Barnabas, c. 11^{8}: *αἰσθάνεσθε πῶς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸν σταυρον ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὥρισεν, τοῦτο γὰρ λέγει· Μακάριοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρον ἐλπίσαντες κατέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*, prove that between cross and baptism there was a very close connexion, —so these observations combined show us the way to find an explanation. We have to look for it in the old liturgies, especially of the Eastern, more or less heretic and schismatic, Churches, for only there can we hope to find traces of a custom which in the Western Church became quite extinct.[8] Anyhow, the symbolism of the cross in the out-

[1] *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 90; cf. Barnabas, c. 12.
[2] Cf., *e.g.*, Greg. Nyss. *Orat. Pasch.* i.
[3] Tert. *De Orat.* c. 13; c. 11.
[4] *Ibid.* c. 24; cf. *De Bapt.* c. 20.
[5] Eus. *H.E.* viii. 7.
[6] *Christliche Antike*, Marburg, 1906, i. S. 257 f.
[7] *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms*, Tekstband. Freiburg, 1903, Bd. i. S. 115.
[8] Cf. H. Usener, *Das Weihnachtsfest*, kap. i.–iii. 2e aufl., Bonn, 1911, S. 14. He points out there that schismatic Churches, which separate themselves from the great Church, preserve for the greatest part the conditions which existed in the time of the separation.

spread hands must be very old. The 'orante' is one of the earliest figures in ancient Christian art. Wilpert, in his *Malereien*, gives 'orantes' already from the beginning of the second century (Taf. 13, the three men in the furnace; Taf. 14, Susanna; Taf. 16, Noah in the ark). In Western liturgy, as far as I know, the attitude as a separate rite is no more to be found; in Eastern rites, it is rather rare, and in most cases hardly recognizable, yet in one it is left quite intact.

Conybeare, in his *Rituale Armenorum* (Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1905), may lead the way. He gives (p. 86 ff.) the ancient baptismal liturgy of the Armenian Church. Of that liturgy Cod. B. gives a rubric, diverging in its text from that of all other codices, which, in Conybeare's translation (p. 92, note *a*), runs as follows: 'Next, the priest orders the catechumen to turn to the west, and stretch his hand straight out in the same direction, as if thrusting backwards the gloomy darkness. And he bids him spit three times on Satan, that is to deny him, and he adjures him thrice, saying: Dost thou renounce Satan and all his deceitfulness, and his wiles, and his paths, and his angels? The priest questions him thrice, and each time the catechumen shall say: I renounce, and withal spits upon Satan. Then he turns the catechumen to the east, and bids him raise his eyes to heaven, and *stretch out his hands confessing the Godhead of the Holy Trinity*, saying thrice as follows: Dost thou believe in the Holy Trinity?'

From what I have said of the symbolism of the cross in the outstretched hands, it is clear that in this rubric the confessional act is retained but is no more understood; for not Christ, but the all-holy Trinity is confessed here. To give an example of baptismal liturgy where the original form of confessing Christ has been altered so much as to be almost quite indiscernible, I quote the Greek baptismal rite printed by Conybeare from the *Euchologion Barberini*.[1] There the renunciatio diaboli and the confessio Christi are prescribed as follows: Καὶ μετὰ τὸ Ἀμὴν ἀποδυομένου καὶ ὑπολυομένου τοῦ βαπτιζομένου ἀποστρέφει αὐτὸν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ δυσμάς, ἄνω τὰς χεῖρας ἔχοντα καὶ λέγει γ'· Ἀποτάσσομαι τῷ Σατανᾷ κ.τ.ἑ. . . Καὶ στρέφει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ἀνατολὰς κάτω τὰς χεῖρας ἔχοντα καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ γ'· Καὶ συντάσσομαι τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ πιστεύω εἰς ἕνα θεὸν πατέρα παντοκράτορα καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.[2] Looking attentively we make here two remarks: first, that the act of raising the hands and stretching them out has become wholly meaningless; secondly, in the confessional formula the confession of *Christ* is retained even in combination with the trinitarian confession which follows.

The last is the case, too, in the Coptic ritual, which we will now quote. It will be seen that this ritual gives a full and clear description of the baptismal confessional act expressed in the symbolic stretching out of the hands. Assemanus gives the text in his *Codex Liturgicus* (tom. i. p. 157 ff.) as follows: 'Deinde (viz. after the prayer accompanying the laying hands upon the catechumens) denudetur baptizandus et *manus erectas in formam crucis teneat* et accedens diaconus manum ejus dexteram attollat et *abrenunciet diabolo* facie ad occidentem conversa, etc. . . . Abrenuncio tibi Satana, etc.[3]

'Tum diaconus illum ad orientem vertat et *manibus ejus erectis dicat confessionem quae sequitur: Confiteor te Christe Deus noster* et omnes leges tuas et omnem religionem tuam vivificam et omnia opera tua quae vitam impertiuntur. Deinde suggerat illi fidem et dicat hoc modo: Credo in unum deum, Patrem omnipotentem, et unigenitum Filium Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum, et Spiritum Sanctum vivificantem, carnis resurrectionem et in unam catholicam apostolicam sanctamque illius ecclesiam. Amen.'

I reprint this confessional rubric in full, because quite clearly may be seen from it the juxtaposition of the older and younger form of confession. Of course, in harmony with the confessional attitude of the outstretched hands is only the confession of Christ, just as it is found in the Barberini text of the Greek ritual. In this ritual, as in the Coptic, the trinitarian confession is *added* to the confession of Christ. In the Armenian ritual, as given by Cod. B., the stretching out of the hands has been

[1] *Loc. cit.* p. 389 ff. [2] *Loc. cit.* p. 395 f.

[3] That not only in confessing Christ, but also in renouncing Satan, the catechumen stands in the symbolic attitude is explained by the exorcistic power of the cross. My friend Dr. Wensinck has drawn my attention to a passage in *Afrahat* (ed. Plerisot), vol. i. col. 960, where it is said that Jesus conquered the Satan *by the sign of His cross*. More near lies what we read in the Arabic Canones Hippolyti in the exorcismal rite before baptism: 'Manus super eos expandat orans ut malignum spiritum ab omnibus membris eorum expellat.' One example more (Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, Oxford, 1894, p. 481): 'Per hoc signum sanctae crucis frontibus eorum quod nos damus, tu maledicte diabole numquam audeas violare.'

retained, but for the confession of Christ has been substituted the trinitarian confession; or rather the former has been omitted after having been combined with the latter. But in this way the confessional attitude became unintelligible, and has been blotted out in all other manuscripts. In the notes to this page I give further examples of the same rite which I have been able to find.[1] It will be seen from them that we do not find the confession of Christ and the corresponding attitude as clearly as in the Coptic liturgy, but the testimonies are so frequent that it is undoubtedly clear that in the Eastern Church it was in frequent use. In some rituals the confession of Christ was dropped, in others the confessional attitude more or less modified, but from all it is quite clear that confession and attitude go together.

It may be remarked that only Eastern rituals have retained confession and attitude. But that before East and West went their own ways the whole Church practised the rite, may be inferred from the words of Tertullian and Barnabas which have been quoted above. At all events, the testimonies are quite sufficient to prove that Dr. Bernard's hypothesis on the character of the Odes of Solomon is very strongly affirmed by Ode 27 and 42^{1-3}. It is evident that the separate act of the outspread hands is a peculiar *baptismal* rite. It is possible that Ode 27 and 42^{1-3} have been *added* to the corpus of the Odes, which in that case needed not to be *written* as baptismal hymns, but could only have been *used* as such. This supposition seems, however, very improbable, especially as neither in Ode 21^{1} nor 35^{8} is there any mention of prayer.

The reason why the rite became obsolete and forgotten is obvious. For ancient Christianity baptism was a confession of Christ. Therefore in apostolical and post-apostolical times we hear of a baptism simply 'unto the name of Christ,'[2] and Paul speaks of baptism 'unto the death of Christ,' which, as we will see, brings us for the explanation of the 'orante' rite *in medias res*. To this baptism corresponds the symbolical act of stretching out the hands. But when the trinitarian confession takes the place of the more simple confession of Christ, the symbolic act becomes meaningless, is altered and forgotten, a process which may be seen going on in the various forms which we have quoted.[3]

We ask, however, what was the origin and *rationale* of such baptism and baptismal symbol? In answer to this question, the Armenian ritual of initiation of a monk gives a nice explanation of the mystical meaning of the rite: 'After this *con-*

[1] A. Baumstark gives in *Oriens Christianus*, i. Rom. 1901, 'Eine ägyptische Mess-und Taufliturge des 6 Jahrh.' (S. 35ff.), where we read: 'Atque postea renuntient ac si quis adultus fuerit pro semet ipso dicat et si minor (natu) fuerit qui eum praesentaverit pro eo dicat cum versus orientem prospiciant et manus suas dextras sursum elevent et dicant: Renuntio tibi, satana et omnibus angelis tuis. Atque item *elevatis ambabus manibus suis* versus orientem se convertant et ita *confiteantur* dicentes: confiteor te pater omnipotens et filium tuum unicum Jesum Christum et spiritum tuum sanctum.'

Of the Æthiopic Church the baptismal rite of renunciation and confession is related by Ludolf, *Historia Aethiopica*, iii. 6. 31 (quoted by Trumpp, *Das Tauffest der aeth. Kirche* in the Abh. d. i. Classe d. (*Münchener*) *Akad. d. Wiss.* xiv. iii. S. 147 ff.), in following terms: 'Neophyti dextram erigunt et occidentem respicientes Satanam ceu tenebrarum principem (N.B.: an explanation of the direction to the West, which with the corresponding direction to the East in the confessio Christi returns in all baptismal rites) abjurant. Mox orientem versus tanquam ad justitiae solem (N.B.) conversi *erectis alte dextris veluti sacramento Christo* et praeeunte presbytero symbolum fidei Christianae profitentur.'

The official text of the baptismal rite as translated and printed by Trumpp, *loc. cit.* S. 175, runs: 'Darauf soll sich ihr Antlitz (d. h. des *Priesters*?) gegen Osten wenden und du ziehest die Kleider der Täuflinge aus und erhebst ihre rechte Hand, und sie sollen nach Westen schauen und er spricht (das): ich widersage dir Satan usw. . . . Darauf wendest du ihr Angesicht gegen Osten und hebst ihre Hände in die Hohe, und sprichst ihnen vor': 'Ich glaube an dich *Christus* meinen Gott und an all deine Engel und an all dein lebendigmachendes Werk, das das ewige Leben gibt' (cf. the Coptic confession of Christ).

In the ritual of baptism and marriage by Jacob of Edessa (translated by Kayser in *Die Kanones Jakob von Edessa*, Leipzig, 1896, S. 121), we read: 'Dann wenden sie sich nach Osten und *ergeben sich Christo*.'

Dionys. Areop., *De Eccl. Hier.* c. 3, has: μετάγει πρὸς ἕω καὶ πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀναβλέψαντα καὶ τὰς χεῖρας ἀνατείναντα κελεύει συντάξασθαι τῷ Χριστῷ.

Cyr. Hier. reminds his neophytes (*Cat. Myst.* i. 2) how they were ordered to turn to the West and *to stretch out the hands* and to renounce Satan as if he were present.

Dr. Bernard reminds me of Jerome, *in Amos*, vi. 14: 'Unde et in mysteriis primum renuntiamus ei qui in occidente est nobisque moritur cum peccatis et sic versi ad Orientem pactum inimus *cum Sole justitiae* et ei servituros nos esse promisimus' (Migne, *P.L.* 25, col. 1068).

[2] Cf. Usener, *Weihnachtsfest*[2], S. 162 f.

[3] The same combination of confessio Christi and confessio Trinitatis probably survives in the expression of a prayer in *Test. Dom. Nostri J. Chr.* ed. Rahmani, p. 125: 'Quoniam tibi vocati sunt servi in nomine Jesu Christi, cum in Trinitate, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti baptizantur.'

fessional testimony and enthusiasm' (so prescribes the liturgy) 'the clergy with one accord raise their hands aloft. . . . *They so imitate the cross and are mystically extended thereon*, and nailed upon wings of holy mystery.'[1] So it is a mystic rite denoting the unification with Christ, with whom the Christian shares the cross and its death, emerging from baptism renewed and regenerated to a new, holy, and blessed life. In this interpretation of the rite I have said more than can as yet be inferred from our text. So I proceed to show that this view is the right one.

[1] Conybeare, *loc. cit.* p. 140.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ISAIAH.

ISAIAH XXVIII. 16.

'Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone of sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste.'—R.V.

1. THE twenty-eighth chapter of the Book of Isaiah is one of the greatest of his prophecies. It is distinguished by that regal versatility of style which places its author at the head of Hebrew writers. Keen analyses of character, realistic contrasts between sin and judgment, clever retorts and epigrams, rapids of scorn, and 'a spate' of judgment, but for final issue a placid stream of argument banked by sweet parable—such are the literary charms of the chapter, which derives its moral grandeur from the force with which its currents set towards faith and reason, as together the salvation of states, politicians and private men. The style mirrors life about ourselves, and still tastes fresh to thirsty men. The truths are relevant to every day in which luxury and intemperance abound, in which there are eyes too fevered by sin to see beauty in simple purity, and minds so surfeited with knowledge or intoxicated with their own cleverness that they call the maxims of moral reason commonplace, and scorn religious instruction as food for babes.

Some time when the big, black cloud was gathering again on the north, Isaiah raised his voice to the magnates of Jerusalem: 'Lift your heads from your wine-bowls; look north. The sunshine is still on Samaria, and your fellow-drinkers there are revelling in security. But the storm creeps up behind. They shall certainly perish soon; even you cannot help seeing that. Let it scare you, for their sin is yours, and that storm will not exhaust itself on Samaria. Do not think that your clever policies, alliance with Egypt or the treaty with Assyria herself, shall save you. Men are never saved from death and hell by making covenants with them. Scorners of religion and righteousness, except ye cease being sceptical and drunken, and come back from your diplomacy to faith and reason, ye shall not be saved! This destruction that looms is going to cover the whole earth. So stop your running to and fro across it in search of alliances. *He that believeth shall not make haste.* Stay at home and trust in the God of Zion, for Zion is the one thing that shall survive.'

2. Isaiah's words have a wide application. Short of faith as he exemplified it, there is no possibility for the spirit of man to be free from uneasiness. It is so all along the scale of human endeavour. No power of patience or of hope is his who cannot imagine possibilities of truth outside his own opinions, or trust a justice larger than his private rights. It is here very often that the real test of our faith meets us. If we seek to fit life solely to the conception of our privileges, if in the preaching of our opinions no mystery of higher truth awe us at least into reverence and caution; then, whatever religious creeds we profess, we are not men of faith, but shall surely inherit the bitterness and turmoil that are the portion of unbelievers. If we make it the chief aim of our politics to drive cheap bargains for our trade or to be consistent to party or class interests; if we trim our conscience to popular opinion; if we sell our honesty in business or our love in marriage, that we may be comfortable in the world; then, however firmly we may be established in reputation or in welfare, we have given our spiritual nature a support utterly inadequate to its needs, and we shall never find rest. Sooner or later, a man must

feel the pinch of having cut his life short of the demands of conscience. Only a generous loyalty to her decrees will leave him freedom of heart and room for his arm to swing. Nor will any philosophy, however comprehensive, nor poetic fancy, however elastic, be able without the complement of faith to arrange, to account for, or to console us for, the actual facts of experience. It is only belief in the God of Isaiah, a true and loving God, omnipotent Ruler of our life, that can bring us peace. There was never a sorrow, that did not find explanation in that; never a tired thought, that would not cling to it. There are no interests so scattered or energies so far-reaching that there is not return and rest for them under the shadow of His wings. *He that believeth shall not make haste. Be still*, says a psalm of the same date as Isaiah—*Be still, and know that I am God.*[1]

I.

He that believeth.

'*He that believeth* shall not make haste.' Freedom from feverishness is a mark of faith.

1. When we turn to the dealings of God with men, there is one thing that impresses us very deeply. It is the slowness of all God's procedure in guiding and blessing our humanity. God never hurries; He moves with infinite ease. He takes an age to perfect one of His thoughts within us. What we might call the leisureliness of providence is written large on human history. Think of the weary discipline of Israel till they had grasped the mighty truth that God is one; remember how men had to wait for centuries before the world was ready for Christ Jesus; reflect that nineteen centuries have gone, and we seem only to be touching the hem of Christ's garment yet—and you will apprehend the leisureliness of heaven. In all God's dealings with the human race, and in all God's dealings with the human soul, there is purpose, urgency, infinite persistence; but no man will detect hurry there. Let the text illuminate that thought. It is because God believes in man that He refuses to hurry his development. If there were no potentiality in human nature, no promise of a divine ideal at its core, a single season might be enough to ripen it, as it ripens the corn that rustles in the field. There are creatures that dance and die all in one summer's evening; and a summer's evening is long enough for them. But a thousand evenings are not enough for man, there is such promise in the sorriest life. When we think how long a little child is helpless, absolutely dependent on another's love; when we think of the slow stages of our growth up the steep slope to moral and spiritual manhood; when we remember that every vision that beckons us, and every hope that fires us, and every truth that illuminates and saves us, was won out of the riches of God, through the discipline and the chastisement of ages, we feel that the belief of God in man is wonderful: He hath believed in us, and therefore hath made no haste. We speak a great deal about our faith in God. Never forget God's glorious faith in us.

And when we pass to the earthly life of Jesus, we are arrested by the same procedure there. He was leisurely, just because He trusted men. He did not despair of them when they were backward; He did not reject them because they were slow to learn. When He had chosen a heart, He trained it with infinite patience, and just because He believed in it, He would not hurry. Compare His treatment of Judas with that of Peter. Christ did not believe in the sincerity of Judas. He knew him to be a hypocrite, and a traitor, and 'what thou doest do quickly'—haste! get done with it! But Peter! Christ thoroughly believed in Peter. He saw the possibilities in Peter. He knew that underneath the sand, driven by the wind, there was bed-rock to build a church upon. So Peter was allowed to go out into the night, and to weep bitter tears under the look of Christ. There was no hurry. Let him weep his eyes out. Jesus believed in Peter, and let him alone. And Jesus was scourged and hung upon the cross, and lay in the grave, and rose on the third day, and the hours seemed endless to the fallen disciple, yet never a word of comfort came from his Lord. Then at long last, 'Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?' 'Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' The wheels of the chariot of Christ had tarried, just because He trusted that great heart.

The man who believes in himself and in his message is never in a hurry to see results. The army general who cannot trust himself grows feverish for some brilliant deed of arms. But Lord Kitchener will wait and plan and scheme till the whole nation grows restless and impatient; he believes in himself, and he will not make haste. It is always a mark of inferior capacity to be in a feverish hurry to be recognised. No genius ever goes to sleep with the wild hope that to-morrow he may wake up famous. Genius is sublimely

[1] G. A. Smith.

confident and easy; with the touch of God-given power comes sweet assurance.[1]

2. Jesus Christ is the 'sure foundation' of our faith. 'He that believeth' in Christ—he, that is to say, who accepts Christ's interpretation of life—'shall not make haste.'

(1) Christ is the foundation of all *restful knowledge*. He is the foundation of all our knowledge of God, and of all our true knowledge of ourselves, of all our true knowledge of duty, and all our true knowledge of the relations between the present and the future, between man and God. And in His life, the history of His death and resurrection, is the only foundation of any real knowledge of the awful mysteries that lie beyond the grave. He is the Alpha from whom all truth must be deduced, the Omega to which it all leads up. Certitude is in Him. Apart from Him we are but groping amid peradventures. If we *know* anything about God, it is due to Jesus Christ. If we *know* anything about ourselves, it is due to Him. If we *know* anything about what men ought to do, it is because He has done all human duty. And if, into the mist and darkness that wraps the future, there has ever travelled one clear beam of insight, it is because He has died and risen again.

(2) He is the foundation of all *restful love*, and the fixed pattern for all noble and pure living. Otherwise man's notions of what is virtuous and good are much at the mercy of conventional variations of opinion. This class, that community, this generation, that school, all differ in their notions of what is true nobleness and goodness of life. And we are left at the mercy of fluctuating standards unless we take Christ in His recorded life as the one realised ideal of manhood, the pattern of what we ought to be.

(3) The foundation is a *tried* stone. The language of the text, 'a stone of proof,' as it reads in the original, probably means a stone which has been tested and has stood the trial. And because it is thus a tested stone, it therefore is a precious stone. There are two kinds of testing—the testing from the assaults of enemies, and the testing by the building upon it of friends. And both these methods of proof have been applied, and it has stood the test.

Think of all the assaults that have been made from this side and the other against Christ and His gospel. What has become of them all? Travellers tell us how they often see some wandering tribes of savage Arabs trying to move the great stones, for instance, of Baalbec—those wonders of unfinished architecture. But what can a crowd of such people, with all their crowbars and levers, do to the great stone bedded there, where it has been for centuries? They cannot stir it one hair's-breadth. And so, against Jesus Christ and His gospel there has stormed for eighteen hundred years an assaulting crowd, varying in its individuals and its methods of attack, but the same in its purpose, and the same in the fruitlessness of its effort. Century after century they have said, as they are saying to-day, '*Now* the final assault is going to be delivered; it can never stand *this*.' And when the smoke has cleared away there may be a little blackening upon the edge, but there is not a chip off its bulk, and it stands in its bed where it did; and of all the grand preparations for a shattering explosion, nothing is left but a sulphurous smell, and a wreath of smoke, and both are floating away down into the distance.

But there is the other kind of testing. One proves the foundation by building upon it. If the stone be soft, if it be slender, if it be imperfectly bedded, it will crumble, it will shift, it will sink. But this stone has borne all the weight that the world has laid upon it, and borne it up.

A Czar of Russia, in the old days, was mad enough to build a great palace upon the ice-blocks of the Neva. And when the spring came, and the foundations melted, the house, full of delights and luxury, sank beneath the river. We build upon frozen water, and when the thaw comes, what we build sinks and is lost to sight. Instead of love that twines round the creature, and trails, bleeding and bruised, along the ground when the prop is taken away, let us turn our hearts to the warm, close, pure, perfect changeless love of the undying Christ, and we shall build above the fear of change. The dove's nest in the pine-tree falls in ruin when the axe is laid to the root. Let us build our nests in the clefts of the rock, and no hand will ever reach them.[1]

[1] G. H. Morrison, *Sun-Rise*, 201.

II.

Shall not make haste.

The word *make haste* is onomatopoetic, like our word *fuss*, and this is its exact equivalent in meaning.

1. 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' That does not mean that he that believeth shall never be hurried. This matter of haste is not a purely personal matter. We live in a hasting

[1] A. Maclaren.

world—a world full of conditions that we did not make and must accept. We cannot live as if this world were a quiet world. We cannot ignore the rush of life. A man in his office may be a saint, but the most beatific vision he shall ever enjoy will not silence the ting-ting of his telephone bell, or stop the rush of telegrams, or lessen that pile of letters that he finds on his desk every morning of the week.

And it is necessary to distinguish the haste of the text from strenuous speed. Every one who is at all in earnest about things feels the push and the pull to get his life-work done; but a strenuous and resolute forwardness such as that is very different from the spirit of haste. 'Unhasting but unresting' should be the motto on every Christian's coat of arms. It is impossible that a true Christian should be a sluggard. Such new conceptions of life have dawned on him; duty, and service, and the building up of character, are so expanded when God has touched the soul, that as with the stirring music of the trumpet we are called to redeem the time because the days are evil. But the man who hastes never redeems the time. You never redeem anything by hurrying up. And it is of that impatience, so closely akin to fickleness—and an age of hurry is extraordinarily fickle—it is of that impatience which knows no inward quietude, and which robs life of its music and its march, that the prophet is speaking here. He that believeth shall run and not be weary. He that believeth shall press toward the mark. He that believeth—God to his tardy feet has promised to lend the swiftness of the roe. But spite of that—nay, because of that—he that believeth shall not make haste.

2. Isaiah linked this great word about living life quietly with a prophecy concerning the Christ who was to come. Christ has come, and the manner of His life among men, and the spirit of it, we know. He said He came that men might have life. It was life they were missing then. And, strange enough it seems to say it in these pulsating and strenuous days, it is life they are missing now. Jesus understood life completely. He was more human than we are, because He was Divine, and His divinity took hold of all that is essential in humanity. And that was the secret of the quietness of the life of Jesus. It was a life lived for the essential things; it was a life lived not for the present but for the for-ever.

(1) It is *missing the essential things* that turns life into a rush and a whirl and a selfish struggle. The world is in a mighty hurry, not because its life is so full—though that is the way it always accounts for its haste—but because it is so empty; not because it touches reality at so many points, but because it misses it at all points. The more we hurry the less we live. Life is not to be gauged merely quantitatively. There is a qualitative measurement. The length of life is found by measuring its depth. It goes inward to the core of the soul. It takes its meaning there and carries that meaning out into the eternity of God. The things that really make life are the things out of which haste for ever cheats a man. 'He that believeth shall not make haste,' because his faith shall show him the futility and the needlessness of haste. It shall gird him with the patience and the peace of them that seek the essential things—wealth of soul, strength of character, purity of heart, communion with God—things that impatience cannot seize in a moment and that faith cannot miss if it seeks them. Haste is the product of a low and mistaken view of life. It is the outcome of a vast delusion concerning the things that matter and the things that last. Faith discovers the delusions, and lays hold upon the few great simple things that really count in life's long reckonings—the clean heart, the good conscience, justice, mercy, sympathy, and the service of love.

(2) And, further, the haste of the world is the result of the *short view of life*. The world is in such a desperate hurry because it has no plan, no toil, no aspiration, which the nightfall will not blot out. Look at the pathetic parable of haste written right across the world—the hurried step, the strained face, the life-driven expression with which we are all too familiar. It means that the world is busy with work it will soon have to put down. If a man means to make money, he knows that he has but a few mortal years to make it. The desire of the world is of the days and the years. 'Now or never' is stamped upon its activities and its enterprises. This does not mean that the haste of the world comes because men have an overwhelming sense, or even any sense at all, of the brevity of life. The modern world does not think of such things. But neither does it think of and realize the eternity of life; and it is failing to do this that makes men the prey of haste. Faith in Jesus Christ teaches us that every man must have time to live. He that believeth shall not make haste.

He has eternity for a practical factor. He learns by his faith to live in the eternal now. His faith reveals to him the simple moral content of the present. There is a sense in which faith alone can live for the present, because faith alone has the future. Unbelief has no to-morrow. Worldliness has no time to live.

We often say, 'I wish I had more time,' meaning, of course, that we wish we could dispose of the hours of the day more in accordance with our personal desires. But our real need in life is not more time but more eternity. Instead of saying, 'Now or never,' Christ teaches to say, 'Now and for ever.' He that believeth shall find the eternal meaning and the eternal issues of these fleeting hours. He shall know that he has time in which to do his best because the highest faith of his soul, the deepest desire of his heart, the most real significance of his daily toil, goes on for ever into the eternity of God. He that believeth can live for to-day a life unhampered by the claims of to-morrow because he is living for the for-ever. He shall not be afraid of missing anything really worth having. He shall not clutch with too eager hands at life as it seems to be rushing past him, for his faith shall teach him—the Christ shall teach him—that life is not something that rushes past us and must be grasped at or missed, but something that dwelleth in us, and the true name of it is the peace of God through Jesus Christ the Saviour and the Lover of souls.[1]

III.

He that believeth shall not make haste.

It comes to this when all is said: it is our unbelief, our irreligion, our foolish eagerness for the things that do not matter and do not endure, our foolish blindness to the quiet, everlasting things, whereof each one of us may fashion his life if he will, that make us the easy prey of an anxious, restless, and precipitant world. Would we be delivered from the haste that is about us? Then let us seek first of all and always to be delivered from the haste that is within us.

1. Thus living for essentials, we shall not be in a great hurry *to enjoy the pleasures of life.* Perhaps the haste to be rich and taste life's pleasures was never so markedly felt as it is now. It is always a difficult thing to wait. David was never more saintly in his life than just when he waited patiently for God. But to-day, when the means of enjoyment are so multiplied and the music of the world is doubly sweet, the monotony of duty has become doubly irksome. We nourish a certain rebellion at our lot, a craving for immediate satisfaction; a bitter willingness to forget the morrow if only we can snatch some pleasure now; and to all men and women who are tempted so—and multitudes are tempted so to-day—comes the stern word of the eternal God, 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' The modern catechism asks, 'What is man's chief end?' and the answer it gives is, 'Man's chief end is to enjoy *life*.' But the older catechism was wiser when it answered, 'Man's chief end is to enjoy *God*,' and God can be enjoyed only in the sphere of duty and along the line of work. Outside of that, the presence of God is lost, and the cup is always bitter when that is lost. However grey and cheerless duty may be, a man must trample down his moods and do it. Then, in God's time, far sooner than we dream, the richest joys will reach us unexpectedly, and life will unfold itself, out of the mists, into a thing of beauty and a joy for ever.

2. We shall not be in a hurry *to see results.* The Christian life is an ascent. It does not lend itself to wild rushes and brilliant spurts. It is an upward climb, difficult and arduous. The task that confronts the Christian can be mastered by patience, and by patience only. The Christian suspects the path that is too smooth, and the cause that goes too swimmingly. He begins to ask himself whether the speed at which he is travelling does not prove that the road is descending rather than rising; or else that he is speeding along some dead level, and wasting his years on the same altitude. He knows that really to lift life demands the fullest force of soul; that the road he ought to travel 'winds uphill all the way.' The man of faith stands committed to a life which is an ascent, and suspects any other. 'He that believeth shall not make haste.'

'The Church was, in fact, anxious to establish prematurely a world-wide Theocracy, and fancied that she saw the means of doing this through an alliance with a world which now professed friendship instead of hostility. She was mistaken in thinking that any form of Theocracy, such as this alliance would establish, could be the Kingdom which Christ had intended to set up. . . . Had she remembered and realized the full import of His saying, "My kingdom is not of this world"; had she been mindful of the stern test which He always laid down for discipleship; had she regarded the method which He Himself consistently pursued, the course of her history would have been very different, and the foundations of Christianity would have been more securely, though far more slowly, laid. "He that believeth shall not make haste"—the haste of the Church was a measure of the imperfection of her faith.'[1]

[1] P. C. Ainsworth.

[1] Hobhouse, *The Church and the World in Idea and in History*, 163–4.

It was a great idea of Nathaniel Hawthorne's to represent the modern pilgrim's progress to the celestial city as taken in a railway train and in a saloon carriage, luxuriously upholstered, so that the irritating discomforts and delays that beset the pilgrimage of Christians might be henceforth rendered impossible. But Hawthorne, before he has finished, lets us see what a fantasy it all is, and how stern an actual reality the pilgrimage remains. It is still a pilgrimage to be plodded on foot, 'o'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent.' Life is still, with all our science and philosophy, a business that demands hard thinking and deep feeling. Every true man who gets anywhere worth getting to, pioneers a path through scrub and brushwood, across steep and difficult ground often; clearing a way sometimes inch by inch with stubborn, patient effort.

'The angels upon Jacob's ladder,' says St. Francis of Sales, 'have wings, yet they fly not, but ascend and descend in order from step to step. The soul that rises from sin to devotion is compared to the dawning of the morning, which drives away the darkness not in an instant, but by degrees. The slow cure, says the proverb, is the safe cure. The diseases of the soul, as of the body, come post-haste on horseback, but they go away on foot at a snail's pace. O Philothea, in what danger are they of relapsing who are taken too soon out of the physician's hands!'

Thomas Henry Green said, speaking of life's lessons, 'A great part of the discipline of life arises simply from its slowness. The long years of patient waiting and silent labour . . . these are the tests of that pertinacity of man, which is but a step below heroism.' The last lesson many of us learn is to 'labour and to wait.' An old man, summing up his experiences, said he had known far more instances of men coming too soon to wealth and position than of their coming too late. The little child who hurries out into the garden and pulls up the newly planted bulb to see whether it is growing is no more foolish than the Christian worker who is impatient as to 'results.' It is hard to 'rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him.'

3. In all *Christian work*, as in Christian character, we shall not be in a hurry to see results. The all-commanding power and beauty of that dear majestic Figure of Christ lie in His Divine calm. Amid the frenzy and fury of the world, the wild schemes, and universal unrest, He stands alone in His transcendent quiet. Where other world reformers fly from place to place, from land to land, in a very passion of vehemence, He passes quietly through the villages and towns of one of the smallest of countries; and with only three years in which to do the work the centuries shall not be able to undo, there is no trace of hurry or excitement or agitation. He teaches line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, sowing gently in good soil the seed that can never die. There stands the life of faith, the calm, tranquil serenity of a confidence that consists with no illusions but only with clearest and amplest vision of God and man. 'He that believeth shall not make haste.'

It is easy for those who do not know sin, who have not felt its awful, deadening, paralysing power in themselves, to wonder at the slow progress of good. But 'he that believeth' will give way neither to easy optimism nor to despair of good. Not less earnestly, but more patiently, not less hopefully, but more trustfully, will he struggle against the sin which is within him and around him. He knows how real it is, how slow it is to yield to the love of God; but he knows, too, that God has laid a sure foundation in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, and though the building of the spiritual temple of restored humanity is slow, he does not 'make haste.' It is enough for him to be a fellow-worker with God in the regeneration of man, and to know that God will in His own time hasten His work.[1]

I haste no more.
At dawn or when the day is done,
The sun comes calmly to his place:
I've learned the lesson of the sun.

I haste no more.
For Spring and Autumn earth decrees
The leaves shall bud, the leaves shall fall.
I've learned the lesson of the trees.

I haste no more.
At flood or ebb as it may be,
The ocean answers to the moon:
I've learned the lesson of the sea.

I haste no more.
Whate'er, whoe'er is mine—these must
On God's ways meet me in God's time:
I've learned the lesson, and I trust.[2]

[1] A. L. Moore.
[2] M. J. Savage, *America to England*.

Dr. Schweitzer on the Interpretation of St. Paul.

By the Rev. W. Montgomery, B.D.

On page 363 of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* (*Quest* 365), Schweitzer wrote: 'In seeking clues to the eschatology of Jesus, scholars have passed over the eschatology which lies nearest to it, that of Paul.' It has been known for some time past that Schweitzer was himself labouring to supply this omission, and the first part of the work addressed to this end has now appeared, under the title *Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung*. It is to be completed by *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, which will contain the detailed exposition of the author's own views, but the present work combines so much criticism with the history that the main lines of his thesis are already visible.

It may be briefly stated thus: Paul belongs wholly and solely to primitive eschatological Christianity; with the Hellenization of Christianity he has nothing whatever to do. That process begins, not with him, but after him. According to Schweitzer's presentation of the history of Pauline study, the attribution to Paul of a Hellenizing influence has been its evil genius from first to last. It led F. C. Baur to import an unreal party strife into the very beginnings of Christianity; it led the 'ultra-Tübingen' critics to transfer even the main Epistles to the second century, in order to provide the lapse of time which they rightly saw was necessary for this (assumed) development. It has led astray recent theology after the will-o'-the-wisp of influence from the Greek Mystery-religions.

That any clear evidence of Greek influence—whether through Jewish Hellenism or direct from Greek sources—has been given, any convincing parallel adduced, is roundly denied; and the difficulties of the theory are thus summarized:

'The theory finds itself obliged to assume an unreconciled dualism between Jewish and Greek elements in Paul, and to assert that he never allowed the two systems of thought to mingle, while on the other hand he never became conscious of their disparity; it has to attribute to him a capacity for combining contradictions which allows him to maintain alongside of one another a spiritualistic doctrine of immortality and a crudely materialistic notion of resurrection, without becoming aware of their incompatibility; it is logically forced to the conclusion that he set aside the Jewish eschatology, with its conceptions of judgment and condemnation, in favour of a doctrine of universal blessedness, whereas there is in the Epistles not a single hint pointing in this direction; it is forced, in order to make his statements "Platonic," so to spiritualize them that the natural sense of the words disappears; it must ignore the proved fact that the doctrine of the Spirit, understood in its full compass . . . is most naturally explained as a mere extension of the primitive Christian view; it must meet the objection—which it never can do—that the original apostles never discovered anything of a foreign, Greek character in Paul's views; it must, when confronted with the history of dogma, bend itself with what grace it may to the admission that Paulinism exerted no influence upon the formation of early Greek theology, and cannot therefore have been felt, by the men who had to do with the making of it, to represent a first stage in the Hellenization of Christianity' (p. 66 f.).

Of particularly timely interest are the passages in which he deals with the theory, popularized by the Comparative Study of Religions, that the Pauline teaching on the Sacraments was derived from the Greek Mystery-cults. He emphasizes the paucity of our actual knowledge of these Mysteries, and sternly demands proof in place of facile assertion. In a striking passage he points out how slovenly is the procedure by which even scholars like Dieterich have imported into Paul's statements about baptism in Romans 6 the conception of Rebirth, whereas Paul's conception is that of a Death and Resurrection. This is a more widely different conception than perhaps at first sight appears, since death and resurrection belong to eschatology, and are here thought of by Paul as an anticipatory fulfilment of things to come, whereas 'Rebirth implies an un-eschatological system of thought in which the individual reckons more or less confidently on a normal duration of life' (169 f.).

Again, in seeking analogies for the Lord's Supper, the students of the Science of Religion

have first made an illegitimate inference within their own domain. They have assumed without proof that the mystery-celebrations contained the idea of eating the flesh of the god in order to draw supernatural strength from it. That conception is no doubt proved for certain primitive Nature religions, but it is assumed without proof that it came to the surface again, raised to a higher power, in the Mysteries (153 f.). The parallel in 1 Co 10 is of course not with the Mysteries, but with the regular sacrificial feasts. With this illegitimate inference is further conjoined the false assumption that Paul taught an eating and drinking of the body and blood of the Lord. That is to interpret Paul by the aid of a misunderstanding of John (155).

In general, there has been great looseness of thought as to the conditions under which Paul could have come in contact with these Mysteries. 'So much, however, is certain that Paul cannot have known the Mystery religions in the form in which we know them, because, in this developed state, they did not at that time exist' (150).

For a connected and reasoned statement of Schweitzer's views we must wait for his second volume, but the following points may be gathered from the *obiter dicta* thrown off in the process of exposition and criticism: First, as to the proper method of approaching the study of Pauline theology. 'The most natural method of investigation would have been to begin with the Eschatology, as the most universal element in early Christianity, and then to try to find a path leading from that point to the central doctrines of the new life in union with Christ in His death and resurrection' (42).

As regards the sources of Paul's thought, neither the Old Testament nor the teaching of Jesus are direct sources for Paul, in the sense of supplying the determining factors of his thought (33, 35). His sources were the contemporary Jewish Apocalyptic theology (as represented especially by the Apocalypse of Ezra) and the eschatological theology of the primitive Christian community—which is not simply the teaching of Jesus, because there has entered into it the new and powerful factor of the death and resurrection of Jesus (34). So far from Greek influence being necessary to account for Paul's attitude towards the Law and the Gentiles, 'it was simply by thinking out the primitive Christian doctrine to its logical conclusion that Paul arrived at his universalism and theory of freedom from the Law' (65 f.).

As for the Sacraments, the sacramental idea is derived from 'the notion of marking out, or 'sealing,' which plays so large a part in Apocalyptic thought' (189). But we are to note that Paul's own view of redemption is independent of the Sacraments, and might be worked out apart from them. It is rather as if he found them already established, and adapted the form of his own teaching to them (167 ff.).

Among the problems which await, and demand, solution, the author notes the following: 'What was the outline of the events of the End, and what answers were given by the (eschatological) expectation to the elementary questions which could not be avoided? Are there two resurrections, or only one; one judgment, or two? Who are to rise again at the Parousia? Does a judgment take place then? On whom is it held? On what ground is it based? Wherein do reward and punishment consist? What happens to the men of the surviving generation who are not destined to the Messianic kingdom? What is the relation between judgment and election? What is the fate of believers who are elect and baptized, but have fallen from grace by unworthy conduct? Can they lose their final salvation, or are they only excluded from the Messianic kingdom? Does Paul admit a general resurrection? If so, when does it take place? Is it accompanied by a judgment, or do only the elect rise again? Where does the judgment take place at which the elect judge the angels? Only when Pauline eschatology gives an answer to all the "idle" questions of this kind which can be asked, is it really understood and explained' (187). And the Pauline mysticism, doctrine of redemption and attitude to the Sacraments have to be explained on the basis of this eschatology.

That will be the task of the coming work *die Mytik des Apostels Paulus*.

The style of the book is 'older,' less 'intense,' than that of *Von Reimarus*. There is not the same constant coruscation nor quite the same lavishness of metaphor. But for that very reason the metaphors used are all the more effective. Of a theory which, in Schweitzer's opinion, maintains itself by blinking difficulties and dispensing with references, he writes: 'In view of the existing relation of its assets to its liabilities, it

would have no alternative but to declare itself bankrupt—had it not astutely refrained from keeping any accounts!' (67) Of the early Tübingen school, and the Dutch radicals, who are led by the common hypothesis of Hellenization to results in other respects opposed: 'The two wrestlers are chained together; whichever of them throws the other into the water, must drown along with him' (107). In another case Dr. Schweitzer's musical studies supply him with a fine image—which embodies moreover a welcome admission. Freely recognizing that familiarity with the Greek language counted for something in the moulding of Paul's thought, he writes: 'He found at his disposal a tone-system in which the modulations necessary to the development of his theme stood ready to his hand' (171).

And here, to conclude with, is an illuminating comparison with more than a touch of poetry. Pointing out that it is not fair to judge the possibilities of the contemporary Jewish theology from the later Rabbinism—any more than it would be to judge the Reformation from the seventeenth-century Lutheran scholasticism—he says: 'The picture which the Epigoni draw for us shows only a sun-scorched plain. But this yellow, withered grass was green and fresh once. What did the meadows look like then?' (38).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

In his chatty book of Reminiscences, to which he has given the title of *Some Pages of my Life*, Bishop Boyd Carpenter tells this story: 'Once Mr. Bucke's subject was St. Paul's statement, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." The heads of his sermon were threaded on the line of "How St. Paul preached the Gospel": he preached it freely; he preached it fully; and so on. When he came to the second head, and wished to describe how St. Paul preached fully, he put in contrast the short sermons which some people desired. "I met a young curate," said Mr. Bucke—"I met a young curate the other day, who told me that he thought five minutes were long enough for any sermon. *I have no doubt his congregation thought so too.*"'

Five minutes is considered long enough for a children's sermon, and the question is, Do the children think so too, and do they think so always? There are preachers to children who preach twice five minutes and sometimes more, and the children listen throughout. One of these preachers is the Rev. J. Thomson, M.A., of Carmyllie. Mr. Thomson has won fame as a preacher to children, and recently he published a volume of his sermons, calling it *The Six Gates* (Allenson; 2s. 6d.). Here is an average sermon. Is it too long?

Our Mother the Worm.

'I have said . . . to the worm, Thou art my mother.'—Job 17^{14}.

I am sure you will say this is a strange text, and cannot teach us much that will be helpful, but I trust you will be agreeably disappointed, for these words are full of great meanings. We know what they meant on the lips of Job. He was in the depths of despair because of all that he had suffered in body and in mind, and he felt so low and dispirited that he thought he might actually claim relationship with the worms. A worm stood, in his eyes, for all that was despised and worthless and mean, and he had been so afflicted by the hand of God, that he could utter these words of utter humiliation—'I have said to the worm, Thou art my mother.' Can we imagine a man lower than this, more abject in his feeling of degradation? We know Job did not mean these words to be understood literally; it was only what we call a figure of speech, to express as clearly as possible how miserable he felt. But what would you say if I were to insist that his words are true in a very real sense, and that you and I, as well as Job, can say to this despised little creature, 'Thou art my mother'? In one sense we owe our life to our mother; she gave us birth; and in another sense we owe it to the worm we speak of with so much contempt. What I am to try to do now is to show you how true it is that, if it were not

for the worms that move in the earth, we could never live, and if we manage to prove this, then we can repeat these words of Job in a way that even he never dreamed of.

It is true that in all ages, and among every race, the worm has been regarded as the type of all that is low and contemptible. In the Bible this is very clearly seen. If you turn up its many references to the worm, you will always find it speaks of it as a creature to be despised and avoided. What is a serpent but a big worm; and what does the serpent stand for in the Bible? It stands for sin; and, in the awful pictures we have of the place where sin is punished, we find 'the worm that never dies,' as the symbol of the dreadful consequences of sin. Turn where you will in the Word of God, you will not find a good word said about the poor worm, because, in those days, no one realized the good a worm could do.

Now this feeling with regard to worms has prevailed throughout the world down to our own day, but in the year 1881 something happened which changed for ever our low opinion about this creature. And what do you think that was? Why, just the publication of a book devoted to the subject of worms. Who would ever have thought they were worthy of a man's study and of the labour that a book entailed? Yet so it was.

Some of you have heard of that great man of science, Charles Darwin, who has done so much to throw light on the wonderful way in which God works in the making of the world, and of every creature that lives in it. He has done more than any man to increase our wonder at the marvels of growth, and the meaning of it, and to increase our reverence for the God who rules and controls all the processes of the world of Nature. And one of the best things he has done is to show us how God uses the little worm as one of His great instruments for sustaining the life of man on the earth. For forty years Darwin studied these creatures. All that time, with marvellous patience and keen insight, he was watching them, noting their habits and the work they did. He kept them in flower-pots in his home that he might watch them day and night; he got his friends to watch them too, and tell him what they had seen, and he sent to his naturalist friends all over the world requests for information about the habits of the worms in their own countries, in India, America, Australia, and through all Europe. Just think of what a change in the attitude of men to the worm this signified—the foremost men of science of the time all engaged in studying its habits. Then in 1881 Darwin published his book *Earth-Worms*, and, for the first time, we understood all that we owed to these creatures we had hitherto regarded with contempt. Then we understood that, were it not for them, life would be impossible on the earth, and that Job had given utterance to a great truth when he called the worm his mother. We speak of the earth as the Mother of us all, but the earth could not support a living thing were it not for the worms that break it up, and make it fit to sustain all that lives in it and on it.

Before we come to speak of the work the worm does, let us look for a little at the worm itself. There are hundreds of different kinds of worms, some that live upon other animals, some that live in the water, and some that live in the earth. It is about these last that we are to speak. I do not need to describe the worm. We all know it with its tube-like, glistening brown body, and we know how it bores into the earth, but we may not all know that the worm has feet to help it to creep along. We do not see them without a magnifying glass, but it has no less than eight to each little segment or ring of its body. They are just like hairs, but help it to move along and keep it from slipping back when it is climbing the steep ascents of its home. It has no eyes that we can recognize as such, but its skin is so sensitive that it knows the difference between dark and light. When light strikes on its body it 'feels' the light as we feel when any one touches our skin. This sensitive skin is just like a hand to a blind man. It enables the worms to know where they are and to avoid any danger in their path. They cannot hear, but they make up for it by their keen sense of touch. This is why they disappear into the ground whenever you go near them. They neither see nor hear you, but they feel the slight shaking of the earth as you walk over the ground and know that danger is near. They are said to feel the rain striking the earth, and I have read that blackbirds know this and tap on the ground to deceive the poor worms, who imagine the rain is falling with its nice moisture, and come up and are caught. There is a weird little poem by George Macdonald, whose delightful books every boy and girl ought to read, which explains the way in which he thinks the birds get their worms for food:

What gars ye sing, said the herd laddie,
What gars ye sing sae lood?
To 'tice them oot o' the yerd, laddie,
The worms for my daily food.

An' aye he sang, and better he sang,
And the worms creepit in and oot;
An' ane he took, an' twa he loot gang,
But still he carolled stoot.

I expect the man of science would remind the poet that the worms cannot hear, but science and poetry are two very different things. If worms have no sense of hearing, they have a slight sense of smell, and are guided to their food in some degree by it. This food consists for the most part of leaves and grass, generally decayed, and the remains of insects and grubs. I am sure you have often seen leaves and grass half-buried in the ground, and, when you pulled them up, you found that they had been dragged into a worm-hole for food. But, besides this, the worms actually eat their way through the ground, and, no doubt, take up from the earth they swallow what is good for food. They live in long holes in the ground, and these they form partly by eating the earth, and partly by pushing it aside. They keep the walls from falling together again by lining the sides with fine earth and cementing it together with the slimy substance we find on their bodies. They need moisture for this purpose, and soon die if kept perfectly dry. These holes in which they live are often of considerable depth, sometimes as far down as four feet, and very often at the bottom there will be a wider part filled with leaves and seeds, where the worm sleeps all winter till the iron-bound soil feels the first touch of spring.

Such are the worms in themselves. The next point to consider is—What do they do? What use are they in the earth?

To put it generally, I would say they enable every living thing to grow. Take the case of any plant that grows in the ground. The greater part of its food it takes up by means of its roots which go down into the soil. But suppose that the soil were as dry and hard as a piece of iron, what would happen to the poor plant? Why, it could not draw a single atom of food from the ground, and would die. Now the little worm as it bores its way through the ground breaks it up, lets the refreshing rain get into the soil and so moisten the roots; it grinds down the earth itself, as we break down food for the little folks, in order that the plant may take it in; it brings down decayed leaves and other matter which acts as manure for the plant; and it throws up to the surface the earth which has passed through its body and which is now rich in material for the nourishment of every green thing. Although they are small, they are very numerous. Darwin tells us that there are over fifty thousand of them to the acre of ground, and that, in the course of a year, these busy little workers will lay about ten tons of fresh soil over every acre. He has further calculated that in the course of ten years they cover the whole surface of the land throughout the globe with a layer of fine mould two inches deep. As he says, 'The plough is one of the most ancient and most valuable of man's inventions; but long before man existed the land was regularly ploughed, and it still continues to be ploughed, by earth-worms.' In other words, if it were not for these worms the earth would be like a piece of iron; so hard that no rain could ever penetrate it; so closely packed that no roots could go down into it, and, even if they could, so dry and dead that no living thing could draw one grain of food from its stony heart.

Are you beginning now to realize how much we owe to these little creatures hidden in the earth? Just think of one or two things that would happen if there were no worms down there. For one thing, there could be no grass, since no seed could ever penetrate the iron soil of itself, and though it were buried in the ground it would be just as helpless, since the ground would be like iron all through. But then, if there were no grass, that would mean no food for the cattle and for every creature that lives on the grass; and since there could thus be no cattle, there would be no meat. But, you might say, we could live without meat of this kind. Then you would have to be called a Vegetarian, one who lives on the plants which grow in the ground, but we have just seen that these are entirely dependent on the worm for their life and growth. There is, of course, corn and wheat; we get our bread from these, and could easily live on bread. Yes; but we have just seen that the grain could no more grow than the grass if there were no worms to prepare food for it. And so all these channels of food would be closed to us. Then think of the birds which we might use for food; if you trace the matter out, you will find that, in the

end, they are dependent on the worms too for their food. A great many of them live on worms, and others on fruit and insects. But there could be no fruit any more than grass. And there could be no flowers, not one bit of beauty would be left in the field, and garden, and wood, for all would die. But that would mean that the insects which feed on the flowers would die too, and so they would be gone in their turn. There could be no honey, because there would be no flowers for the bees. The fish would die in our rivers and all round our coasts, and, finally, there would be no food for any living creature on earth, and all because there were no worms to make the earth fit to support life of any kind.

Surely Job was wiser than he knew when he said to the worm, 'Thou art my mother.' Is there not a very real sense in which this is true? Do we not, under the wise working of God, owe our very life to these humble creatures? Is there not a lesson here for us, in our pride and seeming independence, that on the work of these little instruments of God our life depends? As we see the great trees that wave their heads proudly in the forest, we are to think of the lowly worm working away in its dark chamber in silent faithfulness, making life possible for the giant growth that stands above it. As we see the beauty of flower and fruit, the glory of the rose and the delicate flush of the peach, we are to remember that they owe their beauty, first of all to God, and then to the humble creature He has made which plays so great a part in giving colour and brightness to the world in which we live. As we see the grass that clothes the fields, and the corn that waves in its golden richness through the autumn, we are to look behind to what they stand for as the food of the world, and to give its meed of praise to the little creature we so often crush, unheeding, beneath our feet, without whose labour the fields would be bare and dead.

Let us now sum up what we have been saying about the worm, by emphasizing two plain lessons it teaches us:

First of all, it bears witness to the significance of common things.

We began by pointing out, how for centuries the worm had been regarded as so common and despised a creature as to be beneath the notice of any one, unless it was needed, as Job needed it, as a symbol for abasement. We end up by finding that this commonplace reptile is one of the most important creatures God has made. What a mistake the world has been making all these years! But how do we know that this is the only mistake that has been made about commonplace things? How do we know that there are no works of God lying at our very feet that might rouse us to worship and adoration if we only understood their place and meaning in the great world of nature? Pliny, in his *Natural History*, says: 'Let not things because they are common enjoy for that the less share of our consideration.' That sounds in itself a very commonplace remark; but it is a profound truth to all students of Nature. But it is true, not merely in the sphere of science, but for all who try to understand the way of God in the world of daily life and experience; and there is no truth we are so apt to forget. Let me tell you a story to show what a wrong point of view the most of us have with regard to so-called common things, whether they be actual works of God or experiences of life.

Some years ago a steamer going from New York to Liverpool was burned on the voyage. A boat-load of passengers succeeded in leaving the ship and were saved, and among them was a minister belonging to Dublin. When he returned from his ill-omened voyage he was the hero of the hour, and told his thrilling story far and near with great effect. He used to dwell especially on the signal mark of God's favour and mercy he had received in being picked out from among so many and saved from death. It was a marvellous and special providence that had so cared for him and preserved him. He never told his story without dwelling on this aspect of it, the uncommon mercy of God, as he might have called it. One day he was recounting his strange experience to a company of people, among whom was the great Archbishop Whately. When he came to the end and made the usual remarks about the extraordinary providence that had snatched him from the burning ship and spared his life, Whately turned to him, and said, 'A wonderful occurrence! A great and signal mercy indeed! But I think I can surpass the wonder of it with an incident from my own experience.' Everybody pricked up his ears and listened for the passage in the archbishop's life which should show a yet more marvellously merciful escape than that of this minister from the burning ship. Whately went on in the expressive

manner for which he was celebrated: 'Not three months ago I sailed in the packet from Holyhead to Kingstown'—a pause, while the archbishop took a copious pinch of snuff, and his hearers were on the tiptoe of expectation—'and, by God's mercy, the vessel never caught fire at all. Think of that, my friends!'

You see the moral of such a story as this. The Dublin minister did well to marvel at the goodness of God in saving his life in such a remarkable manner, but Whately did better in reminding him that it is not in the outstanding and remarkable experiences of life alone that we may trace the finger of God, but in the common mercies of our common day. An old writer put it this quaint way: 'When a man was going along the street one day to his wedding, a brick fell from a chimney and struck him on the head; and he was laid dead. And the preacher will say, "It was a strange and mysterious providence." Well, there was another young man on a later day going through that same street on his wedding-day; and a brick did not fall and strike him; was not that event as much a providence as the other?' Of course it was, but, as some one once said, we think that exclamation points are the whole of life, and we notice only the startling things and overlook the commonplaces that reveal the hand of a wise and loving God as clearly as the most amazing incident that ever filled the world with wonder.

Do we seem to be forgetting our humble friend the worm all this time? By no means. What we have just remarked has a direct bearing on all we have been saying about it. It is one of the 'common' things of life, and, as such, has the usual chance of being overlooked. But we are to be wiser than the rest of the world, and seek for the wonders of God's providence even in such things as the world counts common. As the angel told Peter in his vision, there is really nothing common in the world; everything points to the marvellous power and wise and loving providence of our Father in heaven. If He can do such wonders by means of a lowly worm, what may He not do with such creatures as you and me? If we find such a lesson in a little worm, what may we not find elsewhere in the great book of Nature where God has written more fascinating stories than you will find in any book of fairy tales? Like the poet, we too may find:

Tongues in the trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything.

We are not to go out of our way to find these things that speak so plainly of the power of God; the great lesson for us to learn is that we find them at our very feet. As our mothers have taught us the first lessons of life, so let us go to the little worm, which we need no longer be ashamed to call our mother, and let it teach us the first lesson we are trying to learn just now, the significance of common things.

There is a little poem which teaches so well the other part of this lesson, how these significant things are part of our very life and closer to us than we know, that I must close this point by quoting it:

'Oh! where is the sea?' the fishes cried,
As they swam the crystal clearness through:
'We've heard from of old of the ocean's tide,
And we long to look on the waters blue.
The wise ones speak of the infinite sea:
Oh! who can tell us if such there be?'

The lark flew up in the morning bright,
And sang and balanced on sunny wings:
And this was its song: 'I see the light,
I look o'er the world of beautiful things:
But flying and singing everywhere,
In vain I have searched to find the air.'

The other lesson I should like to emphasize is the power of small things.

What a frail, soft creature the worm is. How easily you can crush it. How unfit it seems for the work it has to do in the hard, unyielding earth. And yet what a work it does! And we have seen only a very small part of it, after all; but we have surely seen enough to convince us that God can use very small and humble means to reach His great ends in the world. As an eloquent preacher said, 'The world's Ruler defeated Pharaoh with frogs and flies; He humbled Israel with the grasshopper; He smeared the splendour of Herod with worms; on the plains of Russia, He broke the power of Napoleon with a snowflake. God has no need to despatch an archangel; when once He is angry a microbe will do.' In another of his books the same preacher emphasizes this lesson from the point of view of what man can do. He says: 'The modest daisy was sufficient

theme to secure for Burns a place amid the immortals; a single string stretched on a wooden shoe was all that Paganini needed to demonstrate the master minstrel; and a bit of canvas, a few inches square, was ample to testify to all generations that Raphael was the prince of painters.'

One could make a very interesting collection of incidents in history and experience, great in themselves but remarkable for the smallness of the causes which produced them. Pascal, for instance, tells us that had the nose of Cleopatra been shorter than it was, that is, had she been less beautiful, the course of the world's history might have been very different! A little insect choked Pope Adrian to death, and his death brought a change in the whole current of the life of his time. Anacreon, one of the greatest of the lyric poets of Greece, was said to have lost his life by swallowing the skin of a raisin. In such a simple way there was lost to the world one of its great singers and some of its most exquisite music. You will remember, I am sure, many cases where a very small thing was sufficient to hint to some keen, wise brain wonderful possibilities, such as the apple that fell in Newton's garden and gave him the conception of the great law of Gravitation; the shirt waving in front of the fire which is said to have suggested to Stephen Montgolfier the idea of the balloon; the accidental placing of spectacle glasses by a little boy at play, which resulted in the discovery of that wonderful new eye to man, the telescope. And so on, one might go seeing at every turn the great lesson we are trying to learn just now from our friend the worm, the power of small and utterly insignificant things.

A sermon is not of much use unless it has a practical application. What practical point is there here that one might apply to one's small hearers? Surely it is the power, the great, unknown power that dwells even in such as you. The greatest men that ever lived began life just in the same way as you begin it, with the same childish weaknesses and follies, and at an early age probably showed very little signs of future greatness. How are we to know that in our midst we may not have in the person of a little child, perhaps your companion, perhaps yourself, another of the great ones of the earth? We cannot tell; all we know is that from seemingly weak and insignificant persons and things have come most of the great achievements that have won the admiration of the world.

You think you are but a small boy or girl, and must therefore have a very small part to play in the world around you. Just think of this little incident which happened in New York some years ago. Right in the middle of New York harbour there used to lie a great mass of rock, so large indeed that it might almost have been called an island. This rock was a constant source of danger to all passing vessels, and many a one had spoken of removing it, but no one could be found to undertake such a gigantic task. But at length a man of sufficient courage and determination was found who was willing to make the attempt. For months he had men working on the rock boring holes in it far beneath the water and filling them with dynamite cartridges. At last the work was finished and the rock honeycombed with holes, and each hole was connected to the others by means of an electric wire. What was the next step? Away in a room in the heart of New York there was a small company assembled, and on the table in the centre of the room was an electric instrument. Amid an impressive silence a little girl stepped forward and touched an ivory button, and in a moment an electric spark flashed along a wire to that rock in the centre of the harbour. Down below the water there was a noise like muffled thunder, and the next instant there was hurled into the air a vast mass of rock and water, which fell back again with a mighty crash into the sea. The great rock had disappeared for ever, and it was done at a touch from a little girl. How proud she must have been that day, one would think, and how proud you or I would have been if we had been the one chosen to do this striking deed. Ah! but you and I can do greater things than the blowing up of that dangerous rock. There are far more terrible rocks in the very path that we and our brothers and sisters are taking, and there can be no greater work on earth than the removing of these, perilous as they are. You know what I mean; all the temptations and the daily, hourly dangers that beset the path of every one through the world. Do not say you cannot do very much to help another. Remember the little worm and all that it does in its dark and silent home to make the earth fruitful for us all. It might well

be appalled if it knew how much depended on it and its labours, but I am sure it never thinks of that, but just quietly and steadily does the work God has given it to do, and, as we have seen, achieves a great end. Let us all try and do the same; never stopping our work because it does not seem to be very heroic, or very successful, or even very pleasant; but, like the little worm, let us do the task that lies before us, and it may be we will realize in time the great truth that God has need of us all and that His world would be incomplete without us and our work.

If that is so, and I know it is, then we are all of supreme importance in this world of ours, and while this need not make us conceited, it should give us a new self-respect and also a new understanding of our kinship with every living thing on God's earth which is there because God has placed it there for His own divine ends. We are kin with the worm not merely because it is in a very real sense our mother, but also because we are, after all, both of us, part of God's great plan of life, and from this point of view stand somewhat on the same level. Coleridge must have felt this when he wrote the well-known lines:

> He prayeth best who loveth best
> All things both great and small;
> For the dear Lord who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all.

In closing this study of the worm, let us take to heart these other wise words of another poet and another lover of animals small and great—they represent the attitude we ought all to adopt to these humble little creatures to whom we now know we owe so much:

> I would not count among my list of friends
> (Though graced with polished manners and fine sense,
> Yet wanting sensibility), the man
> Who needlessly sets foot upon a worm.
> An inadvertent step may crush the snail
> That crawls at evening on the public path;
> But he that has humanity, forewarned,
> Will turn aside and let the reptile live.

The Ordering of the Spiritual Life.

By the Rev. J. M. E. Ross, M.A., Golders Green.

'Seven times a day do I praise thee.'—Ps 119[164].

The Psalmist's habit need not be turned into a rule for every man. The only commandment that we in the New Testament era have on this subject is St. Paul's 'Pray without ceasing.' And to pursue that ideal, which must be a matter of spiritual attitude rather than of spoken words, is better than to follow any hard-and-fast plan of prayers and praises, seven or any other number of times a day. The Moslems have a very instructive legend which tells how Mohammed by divine counsel ordered his faithful people to pray fifty times a day. But when he was taken up to heaven to receive his final instructions for the ordering of the new faith, he met Moses, who said to him, 'Your people will never be able to bear it, for I tried the children of Israel with fifty times a day, and they could not accomplish it.' So Mohammed went back to the Throne of the Highest and asked for some remission. Ten prayers were taken off the day's demand, and again ten more at his renewed request, and so on until the number of daily prayers was reduced to five. Then Mohammed met Moses again, and told him how things now stood; and Moses said, 'I tried the children of Israel with five, but they could not carry out even that. Return to your Lord and ask for a further remission.' But Mohammed answered, 'I have asked until I am ashamed, and I cannot ask again.' There is much human nature in that story,—human nature of all ages, races, and creeds, which feels a certain tedium in the ordered uplift of the soul to God, and finds it easier to make rules of devotion than to keep them when they are made. We shall agree, being Christians, that 'without ceasing' is a better rule than seven times or five times a day, and a spontaneous flight of the spirit better than a fixed round of devotion. Without ceasing!—so be it then: if we interpret it not in terms of spoken

words but of perpetual aspiration, it sounds an easier rule than the Psalmist's sevenfold utterance. Is it really easier? There may be different opinions as to that.

Nevertheless the fact may be worth thinking about that the Psalmist had a method of his own of conducting and ordering his spiritual life. It is very evident that most if not all of those who have made much out of the traffic between their own souls and the unseen have arranged that high commerce upon some definite plan: perhaps why some of us make so little of it is that we treat it in too haphazard a fashion, having no method at all. The soul might learn a lesson here from its brother the body. Structure of some sort is necessary to growth: the higher the type of growth the more necessary does the underlying structure become. We do not expect achievements from invertebrates: the bones of a growing child are at once the foundation on which the rest of the bodily system is built up, the support to which it clings, and its protection against serious assault upon its more vital portions. Yet this all-important structure must not be too rigid so long as growth is going on: nature leaves even in the bony structure soft cartilaginous parts that do not harden into bone until the growth of the whole is complete: she combines with the solid basis of our physical life a certain amount of elasticity and adaptability. The analogy might help us in the spiritual region. There ought to be some degree of method in our spiritual and devotional life, if we really want it to grow. Yet, in the one realm as in the other, the structure must not be too rigid: otherwise it may harm the very growth it seeks to serve. The Pharisees were abundant in rule and regulation, but their religion became a yoke which free spirits were not able to bear. Monasticism was equally emphatic in matters of order and discipline, but it became a bondage in which liberty faded and died, a prison-house darkened by the shades of accidie. It ought to be possible to hit the happy mean,—to have a plan of ordering our spiritual life which shall deliver it from the casualness which is its bane, without, on the other hand, degenerating into a mechanism or a tyranny.

Two things are very visible in the pages of Christian biography. One is the discontent some good souls have had, who were painfully conscious of the untidiness of their spiritual life and longed for the power to put into it some sort of method and order. They knew that if they treated their bodies, or their businesses, as they treated their souls, it would go hardly with them. One of the most famous and touching instances is Dr. Samuel Johnson, a constitutionally untidy man, who was always trying and hoping to order his life, especially on its Godward side. 'My resolution, to which I humbly implore the help of God, is to methodise my life;' and he tried to put his resolution into practice by drawing up papers of rules for himself about rising at a certain hour in order to make time for his devotions, about periodical self-examination, about going to church twice and reading the Scriptures 'methodically with such helps as are at hand.' It is something gained merely to have felt this untidiness and shiftlessness of the inward man, and to have had the desire to reduce that untidiness to order. The other thing that is equally manifest in the records of the people of God is this—the comfort and joy they have when they succeed in getting some order, method, and discipline into their lives. This was one of the chief reasons which drew men to the monastic life, and gave it a charm which outweighed for many its dangers and its tyrannies, 'It was a methodism,' Dr. Rainy says, in describing the rise and spread of monasticism,—'a ruled-off way of being good: how dear this is to human hearts a thousand instances have proved.' Take as another instance that same word Methodism, not in its general sense, but in its more special significance. The purpose of John Wesley and his friends in 'The Holy Club' was to make themselves more regular, thorough, and orderly in their performance of their religious and philanthropic duties,—such as prayer, study of Scripture, visitation of prisoners and the poor: it was a characteristic resolution of the little group that they should take communion regularly. It was on account of this emphasis upon order and regularity that a student of Christchurch threw at them the happy nickname of Methodists, and so unconsciously gave a name to what was destined to be one of the largest sections of Christendom. But keeping now to the beginning of the matter, the Holy Club itself, we cannot doubt that a part of its attractiveness was the regular method it established in the affairs of the divine life. There is another accessible illustration in *Grace Abounding*, in the passage where Bunyan pays his tribute of gratitude to the ministry

of Gifford. 'Now, how was my soul led from truth to truth by God,—even from the birth and cradle of the Son of God to His accession and second coming from heaven to judge the world. . . . I mean not one part of the gospel of the Lord Jesus, but I was orderly led into it.' These two words are worth underscoring—*orderly led.* There is an ideal here for preachers and teachers, and there is a gleam of something that all their wiser hearers dimly desire. It is good that, alike on the intellectual and devotional sides of their religious life, men should be led orderly; by orderly leading they are more likely to make ordered progress, and share the joy of those who in their ordered lives confess the beauty of God's peace.

1. It remains to make this practical. Perhaps the first step for any who feel the need of some rule and order in their spiritual life is to draw up some simple regulations for themselves as to the time they can give to prayer and spiritual reading, —how much time and when; and then keep to these regulations with some measure of grave constancy. A man must do this for himself: nobody can do it for him,—even though he may sometimes sigh to have, like his Roman Catholic brother, a 'director' to settle these things from outside his own will. There are various Societies and Fellowships of Bible Reading and of Intercession, but I do not know that they help us much. Only we ourselves can know our lives and our needs, the occupation and proportion of our days. After the assassination of Julius Cæsar, the Roman world reeled for a time into chaos: there was no government and no order; and Cicero wrote to a friend: 'You must be your own Senate yourself.' That is a counsel that applies to the ordering of the untidiness of Mansoul: a man must be—of course with due submission and deference to the Prince of the place—his own Senate himself. But a Senate that is going to govern must be in earnest about governing: it must have some simple laws at least, and it must enforce them. There must be a law of regularity; and a law against hurry; and a law of concentration—'When thou prayest shut the door'; and withal a willingness to try new experiments in prayer and reading that shall take us out of the rut of habit and open to us untrodden pastures. A man should be his own Senate so far at least as to enforce these things upon himself.

2. And yet there is more in this than merely being one's own Senate. The Christian man can scarcely legislate for himself in entire oblivion of the great Church and Kingdom of which he is a member. If he legislates for himself with any completeness, he will legislate for a regular traffic between his own soul and the privileges of the Church, so that some of her broader order and vaster dignity may become a part of his personal life. We are concerned for the moment with the man who is not indifferent to the concerns of the soul, but who believes that he has a spiritual life and wants to make the most of it. His legislation for himself will make him regular at the House of Prayer. It will not allow him to be careless of the Table of Communion. It will ordain that festivals of the Church are to be festivals of the heart as well. It was an unspeakable loss to multitudes of lives that the observance of the Christian Year fell so much out of use in large sections of the Church. Doubtless it is possible to overdo a round of days or seasons, and a multitude of saints' days tends to formality and an empty use of names. But does not one find in the main outline a magnificent training for the thoughts of the individual believer, an 'orderly leading' round the main orbit of the Christian revelation? From the Advent hope to the glorious mystery of the Incarnation; from the Incarnation, by a way that is shadowed with thoughts of sin and of repentance, to the Cross and the Easter triumph; then on to the descent of the Holy Ghost and the full-orbed thought of God; and then, after a long lull in which no great thing seems to happen, a return to the Advent hope and to the prayer, 'Even so come, Lord Jesus.' If we enter individually and prayerfully into this majestic order, it at any rate secures that our minds are in contact at some point of the year with the thoughts that are best worth thinking: there is the opportunity of carrying with us out of this hallowed sequence a regular harvest of knowledge and of joy.

3. There may be room for difference of opinion as to the amount that can be expected from the average busy life in the way of definite ordering on the spiritual side. Probably the minimum on which a healthy spirituality can be nourished is that of a daily and inflexible regularity of spiritual reading and prayer, along with a regular and seasonal entrance into the larger sequence of the Church's privilege and devotion. On that basis

there is plenty of room for us to legislate for ourselves in matters of detail. When one turns back to the book of Christian experience, the impression deepens that legislation of some sort is necessary to success. If we went in quest of the great masters of devotion, Lancelot Andrewes would shine in almost solitary splendour, and his daily prayers were ordered prayers,—moving through the sequence of adoration, confession, supplication, profession of faith, intercession, thanksgiving. There was ordered spirituality indeed,—life and order together as in the beat of eagles' wings. Yet again it must be said that no man's wisdom suffices to lay down rules for another man's life. When we read the paper of rules William Law drew up for himself in his student days, '. . . to call to mind the presence of God whenever I find myself under temptation to sin, to pray privately thrice a day besides my morning and evening prayers; to spend some time in giving an account of the day, previous to evening prayer . . .' we need not necessarily accept all his rules: the question that stirs is this—whether our devotional life would not be richer and more victorious if we laid down some simple rules for ourselves and kept to them. It is not beneath the dignity of the freemen of Christ to make such rules and to obey them. George Herbert has an answer for those who despise living by rule:

> What doth not so, but man?
> Houses are built by rule, and commonwealths.
> Entice the trusty sunne, if that you can,
> From his ecliptick line; beckon the skie.
> Who lives by rule, then, keeps good companie.

And he was not the last to learn that lesson from the stars. One remembers Meredith's Lucifer:

> Soaring through wider zones that prick'd his scars
> With memory of the old revolt from Awe,
> He reach'd a middle height, and at the stars,
> Which are the brain of heaven, he look'd, and sank.
> Around the ancient track march'd, rank on rank,
> The army of unalterable law.

An ordered spiritual life is the negation and conquest of the soul's revolt. The stars keep their orbits; and they shine. The two things are connected: a lost orbit would mean a lost splendour. Let us discipline ourselves in the high task of living near to God.

Literature.

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT CELTS.[1]

Canon Macculloch needs no introduction, especially to those of our readers who have made acquaintance with his admirable article 'Celts' and other articles in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. It is only recently, as he points out, that a really scientific study has been made of the ancient Celtic religion, notably in our own country by Sir John Rhŷs. If this scholar has at times, as Canon Macculloch believes, carried the 'mythological' theory too far, he has certainly materially helped to elucidate the difficult problems involved. Our author himself has special qualifications for the work he has undertaken in the present volume, not the least of which has been a long residence in the Isle of Skye, where the *genius loci* and surviving customs have aided him to realize the spirit of the ancient faith, for the reconstruction of which the materials are lamentably meagre. These materials are enumerated in the Introduction: they consist of more or less reliable statements by classical authors, dedications to gods found within the Romano-Celtic area, figured monuments, coins, symbols, place and personal names, 11th and 12th century Irish manuscripts, the Welsh *Mabinogion*, etc. In the hands of Canon Macculloch surviving folk-customs are made to yield most important conclusions. We can also fall back upon folk-tales, Celtic burial-mounds and other remains.

The earliest form of Celtic religion is found to be a cult of Nature-spirits, and an important point is that the men and the women seem to have had separate cults. The vaguer spirits tended to become gods and goddesses, and 'worshipful' animals to become anthropomorphic divinities. War-gods and culture-divinities emerged till in course of time the pantheon became quite a large

[1] *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, by J. A. Macculloch, D.D., Hon. Canon of Cumbrae Cathedral. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911. Price 10s. net.

one. Most of the divinities seem to have been local in character, although some gained more of a universal character. We know a good deal of the Celtic notions of the other-world, but it is somewhat difficult to arrive at their ethical notions.

The points which we have thus summarized are treated in detail in the various chapters of the book. After a careful examination of rival theories as to origin and racial affinities of the Celts, Canon Macculloch deals with the gods of Gaul and of the Continental Celts, and then surveys minutely the three great divine and heroic cycles of Irish mythology—the Tuatha Dé Danann, Cúchulainn, and the Fians—, and the gods of the Brythons, for which last we can have recourse to the *Mabinogion*, the *Triads*, the *Taliessin*, etc. The cult of the dead forms the subject of an interesting chapter (chap. x.). In most of the usages connected with the latter the dead present a friendly aspect, although occasionally they are popularly connected with evil powers. The same double aspect appears in the cult of river- and well-spirits. The chapter on animal worship is very important, particularly for its account of how animal gods became transformed into mere symbols, and for its examination of traces of totemism. Speaking of the latter, our author cautiously says: 'Certain things point to its existence among the Celts, or to the existence of conditions out of which totemism was elsewhere developed. These are descent from animals, animal tribes, the sacramental eating of an animal, and exogamy.' The Celtic cosmogony is succinctly described, instructive parallels with other cosmogonies being adduced. The prevalence, occasion, and purpose of human sacrifice are set forth, and also the place of prayer and of divination in the Celtic ritual. Tabu (Irish *geis*) is shown to have played a very large part in Irish life, and Canon Macculloch concludes that it was probably known also to other branches of the Celts.

Perhaps no subject connected with Celtic religion has been more misunderstood than that of the part played by the Druids. Parrot-like statements, for which there is absolutely no evidence, have been repeated regarding them from age to age. Even their name has been variously interpreted. The time-honoured explanation of Pliny that it is derived from δρῦς, 'an oak,' is now generally set aside. The interpretation favoured by Canon Macculloch derives it from δρυ-, an intensive, and *vids*, from *vid*, 'to know *or* see': the Druid was 'the very knowing *or* wise one.' At the same time, he adds: 'It is possible, however, that δρυ- is connected with the root which gives the word "oak" in Celtic speech—Gaulish *deruo*, Irish *dair*, Welsh *derw*—and that the oak, occupying a place in the cult, was thus brought into relation with the name of the priesthood.' Our author believes that the Druids were a *native* Celtic priesthood, and not a pre-Celtic priesthood imposed upon or adopted by the Celts from the people they conquered. Very slender, as Canon Macculloch shows, is the evidence that the Druids were philosophers, or that they cherished esoteric doctrines such as that of the immortality of the soul, and were even advanced in their knowledge of astronomy. The truth is that the profession and practice of magic was much more nearly their domain; as Canon Macculloch says elsewhere, 'in many respects they were little higher than the shamans of barbaric tribes.'

Very interesting and important are the three closing chapters on the 'State of the Dead,' 'Rebirth and Transmigration,' and 'Elysium.' But we have said enough to indicate the character and plan of the book before us, as well as its claim to the attention of students. Canon Macculloch has produced a work which will at once take rank not only as a first-class authority on ancient Celtic religion, but as a most valuable contribution to the comparative study of religion in general.

J. A. Selbie.

Aberdeen.

HUME BROWN'S SCOTLAND.

The Cambridge University Press has issued a new, enlarged, improved, and very handsome edition of Dr. Hume Brown's *History of Scotland* (three vols., 30s. net; also separately, 10s. 6d. net each). In a prefatory note the author tells us that this edition differs from the original one mainly in being brought down to the present time, but that in all the three volumes certain changes have been introduced which were rendered necessary by later investigations. It is the last chapter that brings the history down to the present time. That chapter gives an account of Scotland during the last half century in regard to three matters, and three only. For Dr. Hume Brown recognizes that that which is distinctive of Scotsmen and Scotland belongs to politics, education, or religion. These three, single or in some degree of combination, have made Scotsmen what they

are, and enabled them to make their impression upon the rest of the world. Of the three the greatest is religion. Even yet Dr. Hume Brown believes that religion is the greatest. It is not, perhaps, the department of life in which he himself is most interested. The fact that he makes it a distinct department of life is evidence of that. But he is a Scotsman, and knows Scotland. His history recognizes the paramount place that religion has occupied in the history of Scotland in the past, and with all the lightness of his touch he makes it quite clear that religion is the strongest force in the development of Scotland still.

He begins his section on religion with the Disruption of 1843. He shows that that event had a determining influence in the sphere of secular politics, and that its results were equally noteworthy on behalf of education. And then he says: 'If we are to look for continuity in the national history during the last half century, it is still in the history of religion as it is exemplified in the fortunes of the different ecclesiastical bodies into which the nation has been divided.'

The history of the last fifty years is, in the judgment of Dr. Hume Brown, a history of the emancipation of thought. He touches on the cases of 'Scotch Sermons,' Robertson Smith, Dr. Marcus Dods, and Dr. A. B. Bruce, and he says: 'The relations of the Church to its original standards have become such that "heresy" is no longer capable of definition, and that "heresy-hunting" is a thing of the past. And the latitude of belief now permitted, alike in the Established Church and in the United Free Church, has gradually effected a revolution in the traditional type of preaching in Scotland. The doctrinal sermons, to which men now middle-aged listened in their youth, are now rarely heard, and the preachers restrict themselves to the enforcement of a spiritual ideal compatible with the new conceptions of the sacred writings. Along with this new type of preaching has come a changed attitude of the clergy regarding their functions in society. In the eighteenth century, Moderatism with its easy creed and supine social conscience was imposed on the Church by the prevailing tone of contemporary thought. The Church is now cast upon another age—an age which regards social reform as its most urgent interest. As in the past, the Church is adapting itself to the spirit of the time, and its Gospel is no longer restricted to the inculcation of "other-worldliness." Each individual congregation tends to become a social as well as a religious agency, which appeals to the mundane as well as to the religious instincts of its adherents. Thus, during the period that has elapsed since the Disruption, religion in Scotland has undergone a transformation in all that formerly constituted the essentials of every Christian Church, such as is without a parallel since Protestantism displaced Roman Catholicism as the national religion.'

We need not enter into the volumes more fully at present. But there is one thing about them that must not be overlooked—they are admirably illustrated. They are illustrated as fully as the most popular of histories are illustrated, but the quality of the illustrations far surpasses that of the popular history. Photographs form the frontispiece of each volume, and there are more than a hundred full-page engravings in all. The volumes range in size with *The Cambridge Modern History*.

PICTURESQUE PARAGUAY.

There is a fine variety of interest in *Picturesque Paraguay* (Kelly; 16s. net). For Mr. Alexander K. Macdonald has written a book with the deliberate purpose of catching the attention of as many different persons as possible, not in order that he may sell his book, but in order that they may emigrate to Paraguay. It is not an emigration agent's book. Certainly not. It is the book of a lover of sport, pioneering, and travel. But this lover of sport, pioneering, and travel is also much concerned about stock-raising, plantation industries, forest products, and commercial enterprise generally. In short, he is much concerned for the future prosperity of Paraguay, and he has written his book in order to make that country as attractive as possible to as many people as possible.

Let others speak who read it—sportsman, farmer, merchant—an ordinary reviewer who has no intention whatever of emigrating to Paraguay has spent a pleasant hour with the book and is prepared to recommend it and Paraguay to all comers. The extraordinary thing is that this perfectly accessible country, a considerable part of which is owned by British capitalists, and which offers unlimited opportunities to men of much enterprise or none, of much means or none, is

an unknown land. Why it has been left unvisited when worse climates and poorer soil have been overstocked, is a puzzle to the author and to us.

Is there no evidence of the Fall in Paraguay? Perhaps the cyclone is a result of it, just as Noah's flood followed Adam's Fall. 'Our North American cousins tell us tall stories of their floods and forest fires. In the way of wind-storms, however, I fancy the southern half of the continent can sometimes give them a lead. One night, a couple of years ago, the spirits of the woods in Matto Grosso must have been out on the loose, perhaps it was Mafeking night. Anyway, they had a lively dance for a quarter of an hour. The trees of the woods are all securely lashed branch to branch and trunk to trunk by vines often thicker than a man's arm. In spite of all nature's ingenuity, in the path of this cyclone for a hundred yards or so wide most of the trees, branches, vines, and foliage were hurled to the ground in one inextricable tangle, a few bare trunks only escaping the general wreckage; huge branches were spun out into the plains, half a mile away. Strangest of all, as indicating the force of the wind, bitter oranges, perhaps tasted in disgust by the fairies of the night, were pitched disdainfully out into the prairies five or six hundred yards away from the nearest point of wood. I should like to have known what the monkeys said, if they had time to say anything. I am sure I have often heard them swear in monkey language at the approach of an ordinary thunderstorm.'

The Books of the Month.

Professor Mark Baldwin has not been in a hurry, but he has at last published the third volume of his 'Genetic Logic' (10s. 6d.). The general title of the work is *Thought and Things*. Professor Baldwin's intention was to complete his work with this third volume and give it the title of 'Real Logic.' But he has been compelled to distribute that subject between two volumes. This, the first of the two, contains his account of Genetic Epistemology.

But let us understand. *Thought and Things* is the general title of the whole work, as we have already said, because that work is a study of the development and meaning of thought. The alternative and more scientific title is 'Genetic Logic,' and Genetic Logic is divided into three parts—Functional Logic, Experimental Logic, and Real Logic. This, then, is the first of two volumes to be given to the exposition of Real Logic. And what this volume contains is, in unphilosophical language, an investigation into the problems of practice, what is left for the fourth volume being the philosophical discussion of the theory of reality. Until that volume appears we may delay further reference to this, but it is well to draw attention to the fact that Professor Baldwin's work, together with the whole Library of Philosophy to which it belongs, is now published by Messrs. George Allen & Company.

The results of the Cornell Expedition to Asia Minor and the Assyro-Babylonian Orient, organized by Professor Sterrett, are not yet ready for publication. It is expected that the first volume will be issued before the end of 1912. Its title will be *Travels and Studies in the Nearer East*. Meantime it has been determined to publish in advance the work which Dr. Charles has done on the Hittite Inscriptions, being the second part of that volume. It accordingly appears under the general title, in a handsome volume, and lavishly illustrated, every illustration of the utmost scientific value. For that fascinating study, the study of the Hittites, it is of course quite indispensable (Andrus & Church, Ithaca, N.Y.; $1.50).

We do not read Don Quixote enough. Did not Macaulay say that it surpasses all other works of fiction in the world? There are not enough editions of Don Quixote published. We are not tempted enough. But here is an edition which will be irresistible. Its price is moderate; the printing is good; and the illustrations, which are done by Mr. Paul Hardy, and sometimes reproduced by colour printing, are faithful to their text, with that fidelity which only a Pre-Raphaelite and man of genius could give us. *The Adventures of Don Quixote* is the title (Bell & Sons; 5s. net).

Messrs. A. & C. Black have issued *Who's Who for 1912* (10s. net), *The Englishwoman's Year-Book and Directory* (2s. 6d. net), and *Who's Who Year-Book for 1912–1913* (1s. net). These books represent an enormous output of labour; for there

is nothing so easy in the world as making mistakes, and there is nothing so difficult as not making them, unless it be correcting them after they are made. Now year-books are nothing if they are not accurate. And so we say each of these volumes represents an enormous amount of pains-taking and persevering labour. But honest work never is in vain, and the editors may be assured that they have lightened the labour of thousands of other hard-working persons. It is enough to say that those who use A. & C. Black's year-books wonder how they ever got on without them.

Who's Who keeps growing. Last year it contained 4490 columns, this year there are 236 columns more. The increase is due sometimes to the introduction of new names. Thus at the very end we have a new article on the Swedish painter, A. L. Zorn. Sometimes it is due to additional information. The article on Count Zeppelin is doubled in size. The editor is steadily taking account of more foreigners, and there is no better thing that he could do. Will he allow us to make the suggestion that when he gives the title of foreign writers' books he should also say whether they are translated? The two letters 'tr.' with the date would be sufficient.

Mr. Andrew Lang has written *A Short History of Scotland* (Blackwood; 5s. net). And he has written it in short chapters. There is not a word of preface, not a hint about the relation between this and the four-volume history. Is it condensation, or is it altogether independent writing? Are any of the estimates adopted in that history modified? We have to find out all that for ourselves. We find that there is no change of attitude, and yet this history is written quite independently of the other. Mr. Lang was well criticised for some of the things he said, but he says them over again without remorse. That may be wisdom or folly; but it was altogether wise of him to write a new book and not attempt to condense the old one. Condensations are still-born; this book has life in it. It is the work of a master of the English language, and it is a good example of the mastery. It is good for schools and colleges, it is good also for the home. It will last as literature after new histories have modified its judgments and antiquated its attitude.

As it happens, we have no fewer than three volumes by Professor Saintsbury of the University of Edinburgh to notice this month. The first is *A History of English Criticism* (Blackwood; 7s. 6d. net). This volume contains the English chapters of Professor Saintsbury's work in three volumes entitled 'A History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe.' Professor Saintsbury has done well to separate these chapters, bind them together in a single handy volume, and thus present us with a compact and complete history of the criticism of English literature. The chapters are not taken out and thrown together without concern. They have been revised, they have been fitted into one another; and wherever necessary they have been supplemented to make the book, as we have said, complete. There are eight chapters from the original work, and there are five 'inter-chapters,' together with a conclusion, that are new.

When the time comes for the writing of the history of human ambition—it will be less ambitious and more searching than Lecky's *History of European Civilisation*—materials of the most valuable sort will be found in the thirteenth volume of *The Cambridge Modern History* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 16s. net). That volume contains a general index of the whole work, but it contains also a long series of genealogical tables and lists, and it is these tables and lists that will be most useful for the purpose specified. The light that they throw on the history of human ambition is for the most part an unholy one. There are dark spots innumerable, and some of them are distinctly marked. So often have the words 'executed' and 'murdered' to be used, that the compiler of the tables has been compelled to use abbreviations for them. But no doubt there are other purposes which these tables and lists serve We do not think that ever before has the history of modern Europe, or indeed any part of the history of the world, been set forth in so workmanlike a manner or so accessibly for the use of the student. The serious reader of history (and none but the serious read history now) is continually pulled up in ordinary books by the difficulty of relating one person to another, and it has seemed to us an amazing thing that historians do not recognize the value of the two handmaids of history—genealogy and geography. Geography is to be supplied for *The Cambridge Modern History*

in the fourteenth and last volume; this volume supplies the genealogy. For the most part we prefer to have the lists and the maps at the place where they are required in each volume, but there is more than one advantage in having them all brought together in a single volume. It is easier in this way to compare one table with another, and it will be very convenient to have this volume always at our hand whatever volume of the history we may happen to be reading.

The Old Testament in Greek, according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, supplemented from other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint. Edited by Alan England Brooke, B.D., Fellow and Dean of King's College, and Norman McLean, M.A., Fellow of Christ's College, University Lecturer in Aramaic. Volume I. The Octateuch: Part III. Numbers and Deuteronomy (Cambridge: At the University Press; 15s. net). We have transcribed the whole title-page. There is scarcely any other way, there is certainly no better way, of recalling the importance of this great work. And having transcribed the title-page, there is very little else that we can do. Surely there are very few students of the Old Testament, surely there are very few students of the Greek language, who are unaware of the existence of this great work and need to have its scholarship commended.

A few authorities appear for the first time in this third part of it. The most important is the Washington Codex of Deuteronomy and Joshua, one of the four Biblical manuscripts in the possession of Mr. Freer. Thus the scholarship of America takes its place beside the scholarship of the Old World. In other departments it has done so already; the department of textual criticism is the severest and the last.

The Rev. A. G. Walpole Sayer, B.D., Vicar of Henlow, has written a small volume on *The Sufficiency and Defects of the English Communion Office* (Cambridge University Press; 3s. net). His object, he tells us, is to attempt to disprove the charges of insufficiency that are made against the Communion Office, and to show that those who insert into the service parts of the Unreformed Office have no excuse for doing so. In short, Mr. Sayer denies the insufficiency, but admits the defects and disorders of the Office. You will find that the book, as you read it, is much more an admission of defect than a claim for sufficiency.

Professor John E. B. Mayor, late President of St. John's College, and Professor of Latin in the University of Cambridge, was a man all by himself, and his sermons are all by themselves. Mr. H. F. Stewart, B.D., Fellow and Dean of St. John's College, has selected twelve of Professor Mayor's sermons, and they have been published under the title of *Twelve Cambridge Sermons* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net). Mr. Stewart has also written a short biography for the volume which will give those who did not know Professor Mayor some idea of the marvellous man he was, some idea of his marvellous memory, his marvellous intellect, his marvellous loyalty to righteousness. Never were sermons preached that had less of a pulpit manner in them. They touched the topics of the time and spared not, yet every incisive sentence rested upon research, as the notes printed at the end of each of the sermons amply testify.

It is not every Church Magazine that deserves the dignity of a substantial binding, or any preservation for the years to come, but *Life and Work*, the Church of Scotland Magazine and Mission Record, stands apart (Publication Offices of the Church of Scotland; 2s.). There is both industry and genius (witness the numerous contributions of the Rev. Lauchlan MacLean Watt) scattered throughout its pages, and it has an editor who is himself both industrious and ingenious. Are we mistaken in thinking we see an advance in artistic feeling in the illustrations?

The volume of *Morning Rays* for 1911 is out (Publication Offices of the Church of Scotland). *Morning Rays* has been edited for a good many years now by the Rev. Harry Smith, M.A., of Tibbermore, near Perth, and we can imagine the interest it has been to him all these years; but he has given himself to it with enthusiasm. This year it is as charmingly juvenile as ever.

From the Publication Offices of the Church of Scotland in Edinburgh is issued *The Church of Scotland Year Book for 1912* (6d.). Its features seem to be identical with those of last year.

Printed in small type it contains an immense mass of information, and the information is admirably arranged. With a little experience one can in a moment lay one's hand on what is wanted.

Six of the Minor Prophets are translated and interpreted in the new volume of the 'International Critical Commentary,' and three writers have been occupied in the interpretation and translation. The six prophets are *Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel* (T. & T. Clark; 12s. 6d.). The editors are John Merlin Powis Smith, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago; William Hayes Ward, D.D., LL.D.; and Julius A. Brewer, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Biblical Philology, Union Theological Seminary, New York. The progress of this great series is very encouraging. Some men are impatient for homiletical material, but there is nothing more certain than that the pulpit of the future will fail unless sermons are built on the foundation of reliable scholarship. There have been all kinds of authority in the past, and the pulpit has used whatever authority came in its way. But there will be no authority in the future except that of truth. Every one of the Minor Prophets, if we are to make anything of them at all, must be studied with patience. The three able scholars who have produced this volume have placed six of the Minor Prophets within our reach. It will be our own fault now if we do not speak of them with authority.

Of all the books which this season has yet produced the most valuable is a book which goes by the title of *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*. Its author is Mr. A. G. Hogg, M.A., Professor of Mental and Moral Science in the Madras Christian College. It has been published in two forms, bound and unbound (T. & T. Clark; 1s. net and 2s. net).

We have no fear of contradiction or complaint as we call this insignificant-looking book the most valuable book of the season. Its subject is Christ, the greatest subject. It enters into the mind of Christ with a penetration that can have come to the author only after the discipline of a most thorough study of the Gospels. And there is about it that atmosphere which we call the Christian centuries—a knowledge of what Christ has been from age to age to men of mystic or of rational mood—which only a hard study of history could give. And all this is expressed with the utmost modesty in a series of short chapters which look like daily readings.

Is there any movement of our time more flagrantly faithless than the effort to get into touch with those who have gone before? It is not simply faithless, it is folly. If we could get into contact with those who have gone before, we should only prove that it was not worth while. It is not possible to know; if it were possible, the knowledge would not be worth having. The true attitude is to be found in all simplicity and wholesomeness in a little book entitled *Our Life Beyond*, written by the Rev. J. D. Jones (Clarke & Co.; 1s. net).

Professor F. G. Peabody of Harvard is perhaps more popular in this country than any other American preacher. He has that combination of the spiritual and the ethical, and that absence of the doctrinal, which seems to be most agreeable to the British palate at present. And of course he is comfortably brief. Professor Peabody has already published two volumes entitled *Mornings in the College Chapel*, and one entitled *Afternoons in the College Chapel*. He has now published what he says is the concluding volume of the series. Its title is *Sunday Evenings in the College Chapel* (Constable; 5s. net).

The Life and Work of Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., by J. N. Gupta, M.A., I.C.S. (Dent; 10s. 6d. net), is the biography of a Hindu written by a Hindu and introduced by a Hindu. The introduction has been written by His Highness the Maharaja of Baroda. It is a handsome volume of 500 well-filled pages, and it is enriched with four photogravures and ten half-tones.

But the book does not depend for its interest upon any of those things. It is a biography that is quite able to take its place in biographical literature on its own merits. We have just one fault to find with it, and we had better have it out at once. Too many quotations are made from newspaper reviews of Mr. Dutt's books. It is a pardonable offence under the circumstances, but it has the appearance of padding, which the book does not need. We congratulate Mr. Gupta

heartily upon having so worthy a subject, and upon treating it so worthily.

Mr. Dutt was a scholar, a novelist, an historian, an economist, a politician, and a poet. What was he not? Perhaps he spent himself too promiscuously. His poetry certainly never came to much, and he never claimed much consideration for it. He will be remembered most of all by the work he did on the history of India, but this biography makes it evident that he was himself a better and a greater man than all his works declare. He was especially what is called 'a family man' of a very acceptable kind. With all the interests of his life in all their variety and in all their pressure he kept the first place morning, noon, and night for his own family. Many of the letters which he wrote to his daughters are published here, and, although there is little in them for the outsider, there is much in them for an estimate of the man.

Whatever the criticism of the Bible has done, it has not diminished, but rather increased, the interest in Palestine. No doubt the greater facility for travelling, both to Palestine and in Palestine, would itself have increased the number of travellers. But if that accounts for the number of books that this season already has produced, it has nothing to do with their deep interest. Men are carried from Jaffa to Jerusalem by railway now, but the fascination of the land holds them still. Another volume appears this month, a volume which contains much more than an ordinary traveller's impressions. In systematic fulness, and even in outward appearance, it reminds us of the most popular of all books on Palestine—Thomson's *Land and the Book*. The letterpress does not enter so minutely into details regarding the customs of the country, but the illustrations are far more numerous. The author of the book is Mr. G. E. Franklin, F.R.G.S., the well-known lecturer on Palestine. The illustrations are from photographs taken by himself. The title of the book is simply *Palestine Depicted and Described* (Dent; 10s. 6d. net).

The first number of *The International Review of Missions* (Oxford University Press; 2s. 6d. net) came just too late for notice last month. We have had the more opportunity to test its quality. The first thing to ask is whether the editor is an editor or not. What experience Mr. Oldham has had, we do not know. What strikes us in his notes is their definiteness of aim. He sees what he would do, and he lets us see. There is undoubtedly also a sense of the greatness of the work to which he has put his hand. If, in addition to the notes, he is responsible for the choice of contributors, he begins his work well. Some great name was necessary to open with, a greater for his purpose he could not have got than the Right Hon. James Bryce, D.C.L. Then he had to furnish his readers with an article of really permanent value. That article he obtained from President Harada of Kyoto, and he properly puts it in the middle of the magazine. He even discovered his lady. Agnes de Sélincourt writes on 'The Place of Women in the Modern National Movements of the East'; and Dr. Mott sent him his business article. Altogether he has made such a first number that he will have to be very diligent in order to make a better second.

When Professor Stalker wrote his *Imago Christi* there were those who doubted the wisdom of a title which suggested comparison with À Kempis, but Dr. Stalker was not put to shame. It is even more dangerous to suggest comparison with John Bunyan. Nevertheless a volume has just been published under the title of *The Story of Matthew and Mercy* (Drummond's Tract Depot, Stirling; 2s. 6d.), which openly claims to be the 'Third Part to Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress.' It was written by the late Rev. James E. Walker, M.A., of Cheltenham. And we will be bold enough to say that Bunyan himself would not have been ashamed of it. Indeed, there is a certain tone of scholarship which Bunyan never possessed and laid no claim to, an indefinable but real recognition of proportion and a finish in doctrine and in experience. Even the inspiration which men call genius on account of the degree of its manifestation in Bunyan is present here also. Whether or not the book will 'catch on,' it is impossible to say, but if it does, it will catch on to some purpose.

Along with Professor Saintsbury's *Short History of English Literature*, to be mentioned later, be sure you take the same writer's *Loci Critici* (Ginn & Co.). It is a volume of passages illustrative of critical theory and practice from Aristotle downwards. The passages have been selected, partly translated, and arranged with notes; and the

volume has been prepared that it may serve as an introduction to the study, not only of English literature, but of the literature of the world. The passages it contains are themselves literature, but they are also criticisms of literature. They may be read for their own sake, and they may be read also for the purpose of obtaining a mastery of the art of criticism. Professor Saintsbury is one of the wonders of our time. The wonder is not that he writes so much, but that he writes so much so well. This may have been an easy book to prepare; it is a valuable book to possess.

The proper study of mankind is man, and an interesting form of it is the study of prehistoric man. There are few subjects of study that seize the ordinary imagination more fiercely. Dr. Arthur Keith of the Royal College of Surgeons has written a book on *Ancient Types of Man* (Harpers; 2s. 6d. net). It is short, it is authoritative, it is well written, it is strikingly illustrated. It belongs to Harper's 'Library of Living Thought,' and it will carry the knowledge of that Library further afield than any other volume in it.

Mr. L. H. Jordan, B.D., is the editor, and Mr. W. F. Henderson of Edinburgh is the publisher, of *The Pastor's Diary and Clerical Record* (2s. net).

There are signs that the expository discourse is coming in again. If it comes with the literary grace and the spiritual sincerity of those studies in the life of our Lord which have been published by the Rev. Thomas Marjoribanks, B.D., of Colinton, under the title of *The Fulness of the Godhead* (Gardner Hitt; 1s. 6d. net), we may safely predict prosperity to the pulpit of the next generation.

Professor Ramsay has now published in volume form, and under the title of *The First Christian Century* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net), the criticism of Dr. Moffatt's *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, which he contributed last year to *The Expositor*. The volume, however, is not merely a reproduction of those articles; there is an enlargement here and there, and a few separate notes are added at the end.

A substantial volume on *The Work of the Ministry* has been written by Professor W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., and published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (6s. net). Substantial, we say. There is no pretence of originality, and there is no suspicion of sensationalism about it. It is a manual of instruction. Every part of the ministerial life is touched in it, and every part that is touched is served with wise instruction and warm-hearted advice. In order that nothing may be omitted to make the volume complete, there is a full bibliography at the end, elaborately divided into sections. The indexes themselves are an essential part of the book and as satisfactory as any other part.

How difficult it seems to be to carry even the most familiar quotation in the memory quite correctly. A man like the Rev. J. A. Hutton, M.A., a man with a knowledge of literature and a feeling for style, tells us that Hamlet said, 'Who would fardels bear, to grunt and sweat under a weary load but that the thought of something after death, that undiscover'd bourne from which no traveller has returned, puzzles the will.' But if any one lights upon that quotation in Mr. Hutton's new book, *The Winds of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net), and, in estimating the worth of the volume by its accuracy, lays the book aside, he will miss reading one of the most stimulating books of this publishing season.

Under the title of *Other Sheep* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.), Mr. Harold Begbie has published a sequel to the volume which he called *Broken Earthenware*. That gave an account of the work of the Salvation Army in London; this gives an account of the work in India. It is not a mere narrative of facts. Mr. Begbie does not count heads; he is a student of the psychology of conversion. His interest is in hearts; he writes for impression, not for instruction. He is a poet. With all his material he takes the liberty that a poet is allowed to take.

Professor M'Fadyen, while in Canada, was a diligent maker of books. He continues the making of books in this country, though he has on his shoulders the weight of a Glasgow Chair of Hebrew. Professor M'Fadyen makes books for the people. Whatever interest he may have in the diligent student of Hebrew, and no doubt he has much interest in him, his sympathetic soul goes out to the man in the pew, or even to the

man in the street, to the man who is hungering and thirsting for the bread of life much more than to the man who is ambitious for the name of scholar. His latest book is a popular commentary on *The Epistles to the Corinthians* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is a popular commentary, he says. There are Greek words in it which may become a terror to the unlearned. But these Greek words can for the most part be got over. And after that it is all plain sailing.

The volume of sermons by the Rev. T. G. Selby which was published immediately after his death turned out to be a little disappointing. It will not be so with the volume just issued under the editorship of the Rev. W. L. Watkinson, and with the title of *The God-Lit City* (Kelly; 2s. net). Mr. Watkinson has had plenty of MSS. to select from, and he has known what to select. 'Here,' he says rightly, 'are all the strength, beauty, and sincerity which distinguish the author's former writings, and the same practical design.'

The publishers of the works of the late Professor William James have been fortunate in finding another book to publish. Nor have they had any difficulty in finding it. Professor James had himself intended, shortly before his death, to republish a number of essays and addresses which he had contributed to magazines, and he had fixed upon a title. His son has carried out the intention, and retained the title *Memories and Studies* (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net). The subjects of the articles, whether biological or philosophical, are all in line with Professor James's special study; they are all psychological. And they are all encompassed with that literary atmosphere which was his alone. Perhaps there is more literature and less philosophy than usual, for that is more suitable. Professor James had no love of mere learning. The minutiæ of scholarship, though within his grasp, were put away from him. For these things are without the man, and do not sufficiently affect the life that he lives. Professor James is interested in life, for that is within the man. The more incalculable it is, the more he is interested in it.

There never surely was a volume of sermons published of more simplicity of thought or of more tenderness of feeling than the volume called *Sermons and Addresses*, by Dr. Edward King, the late Bishop of Lincoln (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). It is edited by Canon B. W. Randolph. The editor warns us against thinking that simplicity here means superficiality; he might have warned us also against thinking that tenderness means sentimentality. Both are virtues in their purest form, and because they live, the book will live also.

A contribution has been made to the propagation of the faith of Islam in England by the publication of a volume entitled *The Teachings of Islam* (Luzac; 1s. 6d. net). The volume contains a paper written by the late Mirza Ghulam Ahmad, the promised messiah and Mahdi and the founder of the Ahmadiyya in Islam, and read by a follower of his at the great Religious Conference held at Lahore in December 1896. Five subjects were selected for discussion by the conveners of that Conference, and this paper discussed these five subjects from the Muslim point of view. They are: (1) The physical, moral and spiritual conditions of man; (2) the state of man in the after-life; (3) the real object of the existence of man and the means of its attainment; (4) the effect of actions in the present life and the life to come; and (5) the source of Divine knowledge.

A new volume on Tennyson has been published. It is supplementary to the Memoir, bound uniformly with it, and edited also by Hallam, Lord Tennyson. Its title is *Tennyson and his Friends* (Macmillan; 10s. net). The appearance of the volume suggests an explanation of its origin. Did the editor of the Memoir write to Tennyson's friends and ask for contributions to it, and did he receive so many that he could not include them in the Memoir itself without giving it the appearance of patchwork? Whereupon, did he come to the determination to publish all these contributions in a volume by themselves? In any case, here is a volume of contributions by Tennyson's friends. Some of them are long, and some of them are short. Some of them have very little that is new in them, others have a good deal. But they are all alike in one respect. Their admiration for Tennyson is as near worship as good Christians and Church people dare attain to.

The one disappointing chapter is Sir Henry Craik's account of the relation between Tennyson and Lushington. There is no topic in Tennyson's

life that offers itself more openly to fresh treatment. Sir Henry Craik seems to have had nothing to say, and he says it very stiffly. At the other extreme is the amusing and memorable picture of Tennyson's eldest brother, Frederick, which has been drawn by Mr. Charles Tennyson. Between those two chapters there lie longer and shorter chapters on many features in Tennyson's character and on many friends of his life, chapters which have been written in the fearless confidence of affection by Lady Ritchie, Miss Margaret L. Woods, Dr. Montagu Butler, Mr. Wilfrid Ward, Sir Oliver Lodge, and others.

The offence of Comparative Religion, as it is persistently called, is not that it reduces Christianity to the level of other religions; it is that it sometimes attempts to reduce Christ to the level of other men. And this objection must be taken to an otherwise admirable book entitled *Great Religious Teachers of the East*, which has been written by Mr. Alfred W. Martin, Associate Leader of the Society for Ethical Culture of New York (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). The book contains seven chapters and a bibliography. Here are the titles of the chapters: (1) The Discovery of the Sacred Books of the East and its Results; (2) Gotama, the Buddha; (3) Zoroaster; (4) Confucius and Lao-Tze; (5) The Prophets of Israel and the Commonwealth of Man; (6) Jesus; (7) Mohammed. Mr. Martin has studied his subject, and he can write clearly while tersely. You obtain an excellent idea of the personality and influence of each of the religious leaders he describes. But there stands Jesus in His chronological place, and no skill of this clever writer or of any other is able to hold Him there. Mr. Martin understands Mohammed, but he has missed the meaning of Jesus.

After the phenomenal success of Green's *Short History of England*, short histories poured from the press, and the publishers had enough of them. But the glut has been forgotten, and short histories have begun to appear again. This month we have Andrew Lang's 'Short History of Scotland,' and a reissue of Saintsbury's *A Short History of English Literature* (Macmillan; 8s. 6d.).

It takes a clever man to write a short history of anything, but it takes the cleverest of clever men to write a short history of English Literature. No one has had more experience or more success in writing books on English Literature than Professor Saintsbury. No one knows better the difficulty of writing a short history. And yet he has been bold enough to reject the bird's-eye view and the sweeping generalization. He has given himself to the collection and arrangement of facts; in other words, his method has been to provide the student with the materials and leave him to form his own judgment upon them.

The book appeared first in 1898. It has been reprinted six times, and in each reprint up to this last, Professor Saintsbury has read the text through with care and dealt with it in the light of fuller knowledge and later literature.

Messrs. Macmillan have published a new edition of *The Theory of Political Economy*, by Professor Stanley Jevons (10s. net). The first edition was published in 1871. The second edition with a long new preface, which is reprinted here—for it is an essential part of the work—appeared in 1879. Before the third edition was called for in 1888, Professor Jevons had died, and that edition was prepared for press by his wife, who added an appendix bringing the literature up to date. The fourth edition has been edited by Professor Jevons' son, himself Professor of Economics and Political Science in the University College of South Wales.

In preparing a new edition the editor resolved to leave the text as his father had written it, making only an occasional alteration, or occasional explanation of a difficult passage. The book was the first important attempt in English to develop a system of economics from a basis of psychological facts and by the mathematical method, and to alter the text would have been to alter the whole scheme and purpose of the book. But this edition has its independent value in three new appendixes, and in the improvement of two old ones. The editor promises a sixth appendix to be issued separately; it will contain a bibliography of the subject, classified and complete.

Messrs. Macniven & Wallace have published *The Scottish Church and University Almanac for 1912* (1s. net). We have mentioned the book year by year on its publication, but we are not sure that we have ever drawn attention to its remarkable accuracy. We expect accuracy in an almanac, but the surprise with the Scottish Church

and University Almanac is that, so far as we can remember, we have never found an error in it.

It is not every king that can write the history of his kingdom. But what do you think of a native African king doing it? What do you think of two native African kings? Daudi Kasagama, King of Toro, and Andereya Duhaga, King of Bunyoro, have each written a history of his own land. It was no light task for them, for they had no clear idea of the subject, and they were just learning to wield the pen. But they were encouraged by Mrs. A. B. Fisher, and they did write each his history, and wrote it in such a way that Mrs. Fisher has been able to publish both histories together in one volume under the title of *Twilight Tales of the Black Baganda* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net).

Why 'Twilight Tales'? Because the history was in each case obtained from the lips of old men who came on command to the kings' palaces. Squatted on the floor—quaint, withered-up, skin-clad ancients as they were—they related the legends that had been handed down by the generations of sages before them. The excellent illustrations will increase the interest of the book. But it did not need illustrations to make it interesting.

When we have established the fact of our Lord's miracles in the Gospels, we must find time to look at their contents. Mr. G. R. Harding Wood, B.A., discovers some valuable instruction in them for the present time. The method by which he conveys it is to retail the story of the miracle in modern and lively language, with an occasional comment thrown in. The title he has given his book is *Miracle Messages* (Marshall Brothers; 1s.).

Messrs. Marshall Brothers have also published a popular history of Hezekiah and his times, with illustrations from the monuments. The title is *Hezekiah the King* (1s. net).

The new volume in the series on Christian Faith and Doctrine, published by the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, has been written by the Rev. G. Hanson, M.A., D.D., of Belfast. Its subject is *The Resurrection and the Life*. The book is described on the title-page more fully as 'A Study of the Resurrection and Ascension Narratives in the Gospels, and of the Threefold Version in the Acts, of Christ's Appearance to Saul on the Way to Damascus.' It is, in short, a volume of apologetic up to date, for we are back again to the miracles. And there is just one miracle that is worth arguing for, the rest being all included in it—the Resurrection.

There seems to be little interest or profit at present in the study of theology by itself, but if it is studied in relation to one or more of those three other sciences—anthropology, psychology, philosophy—then there seems to be as much interest in its study as ever, and a great deal more profit for life and conduct than has been found in theology for many a day. Mr. Clement C. J. Webb, Fellow and Tutor of Magdalen College, Oxford, has written a book on *Problems in the Relations of God and Man* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). Mr. Webb recognizes the importance of studying theology in the light of anthropology and psychology, but he thinks that a good deal of attention is at present being turned to both these branches. There is also a good deal of literature upon them both, to which the student can be directed. In any case he himself is not able, he says, to speak with the authority of a first-hand investigator, either on anthropology or on psychology, and accordingly he has confined himself to the philosophical side of religion.

Mr. Webb has taken three fundamental antitheses, and offers us a religious and philosophical discussion of them. These antitheses are Reason and Revelation, Nature and Grace, Man and God. Although they are antitheses, or perhaps because they are antitheses, they have given rise to the great problems which have troubled the mind of man from the beginning. Mr. Webb's order is arresting. We should have expected Man and God first and the great problem of personality, next the attitude of man to God or nature and grace, and last of all a knowledge of God attainable by man in reason and revelation. But Mr. Webb has chosen his order deliberately.

Messrs. Nisbet have issued *Nisbet's Church Directory and Almanac* (2s. net), *The Church Pulpit Year-Book* (2s. net), and *Nisbet's Full-Desk Calendar* (1s. net), all for 1912. The sermons in *The Church Pulpit Year-Book* are condensed, but they are more readable and, we should think, more useful than the familiar sermon skeleton.

There is some flesh and blood upon them. There are even eyes occasionally to see, through in the form of pointed illustrations.

But the *Church Directory and Almanac* is still the great surprise. It is up to date, the appointment to the Bishopric of Sodor and Man, which was not announced till December 5, being found in it, as the editor triumphantly points out. But more than that, it is accurate and it is complete. We do not envy the editor his proof-reading, but we admire his patience and unerring eye.

We have already mentioned the fact that Dr. Kelman has reissued his articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on the 'Pilgrim's Progress,' and that he has given the volume the title of *The Road* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net). But we have not had time to say how pleased we are with the reissue. The volume as a volume is nearly perfect, according to our ideal of a volume. In addition to the other elements that make up its perfection, it has eight full-page illustrations, printed on plate paper with a marvellous artistic beauty. So that, taking all together into account — the contents which are so exquisite in their literary form and so wholesome in their religious teaching and the outward attractiveness of the volume—its price is such a surprise that we had to make certain it was not a mistake.

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have published a tercentenary lecture on Archbishop Leighton, delivered by the Rev. D. Butler, D.D. in St. Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh. The title is *Unity, Peace and Charity* (1s. net).

The possessor of the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund* will be glad to know that an index has been published covering each year's issue from the year 1893 to 1910 (Office of the Fund; 5s.). It is a thoroughly workmanlike index in three parts—Authors, Illustrations, and Subjects. We should have been glad certainly of a fourth part containing Scripture texts.

Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version (Quaritch; 7s. 6d. net) is the title which Mr. Hoskier has given to a volume which contains a detailed examination of the text of the Apocalypse and a review of some of the writings of the Egyptian monks. Mr. Hoskier's work is all textual, and everything that he writes makes some advance in our knowledge of the text of the New Testament. If this study is less popular than it used to be, his enthusiasm will recover for it something of its former popularity. For the student of the Apocalypse, whether he has an interest in textual criticism or not, the volume will be found necessary.

The 'Devotional Commentary,' edited by the Rev. A. R. Buckland, and published by the Religious Tract Society, will be a considerable library when it is finished. Genesis required three volumes, and the Psalms three, and as the first volume of *Romans* (2s.) covers only the first five chapters, that Epistle also will require three volumes. The author of the Commentary on Romans is the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D., formerly Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, now Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis in Wycliffe College, Toronto. Dr. Thomas contributed the volumes on Genesis. Those volumes gave the General Editor confidence. The scholarship, the evangelical warmth, and the knowledge of devotional literature discovered in them, made it easy for him to offer Dr. Thomas the Epistle to the Romans; and it will be a distinct advantage to the series to have Genesis and Romans done by the same hand, so many are the points of contact between these two books of the Bible.

Mending Men is the title of a book by Mr. Edward Smith, J.P., which contains information about the Adult School Movement (R.T.S.; 1s. net). Accurate information about the Adult School Movement is very welcome, and it could not have been given to us in a more lively or agreeable form. Dr. Horton, who introduces the book, hopes that it will be read by 'all parsons and priests'; he might have added 'and all people.'

Samuel M. Zwemer and Amy E. Zwemer have together written a pleasant book for children on mission work in Arabia. They have called the book *Zigzag Journeys in the Camel Country* (Revel; 2s. 6d. net).

There is an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* for December called 'Heckling the Church.' The writer of the article shows that in every generation

there have been men and women who found preaching a failure and prophesied the speedy shutting up of all the churches. It is a heartening article. Few things did Israel more good than the exposure of the false prophet. It does us good to have him put to ridicule still.

After that article read Professor A. T. Robertson's book, *The Glory of the Ministry* (Revell). It is fundamentally an exposition of the great passage in 2 Cor. (2^{12}–6^{10}) which Professor Robertson speaks of as 'Paul's apologetic for preaching.' Starting from that passage this experienced preacher and teacher of preachers carries us away from all the depressing thoughts of the failure of the ministry. It is not possible that a ministry so inspired should fail.

The best use to make of the book will be to accept its suggestion of a course of sermons with some portion of the passage in 2 Cor. as the text of each sermon. In that way we shall get alongside the author, and shall see some of the things which he sees in St. Paul, and gain some of the confidence. Is there anything that we are more in need of at the present time than a heightened sense of the glory of the ministry? Preachers need it for themselves. When preachers have it for themselves, and act upon it, they impress it upon the people. For that purpose there is no book of more immediate or greater worth than this new book of Professor Robertson.

Professor Orr has written an introduction to *Hadassah, Queen of Persia*, by Agnese Laurie-Walker (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net), and unlike most benevolent men who write introductions, he says no more than the book deserves, although he says a good deal. He says 'that no one can fail to be struck by the glow of style and the remarkable power of description and poetic conception of Oriental situations which the book displays.' It is all quite true, for this is neither history pure and simple, nor fiction pure and simple; it is the Book of Esther, its persons and its scenes made real to Western minds by the historical imagination.

The Bishop of Edinburgh is one of the great preachers of our day. His new book lifts its head above the multitude of the volumes of sermons which this season has produced. Its title is *Life's Chance* (Robert Scott; 4s. 6d. net). The sermons which the volume contains gather round the one central theme of the love of God. Some years ago the question was put to Dr. Walpole, 'Can a man love God?' It is a common enough question, but to him it seemed uncommon, the question of questions. He did not rest until he had done his might to answer it, and this is the answer.

Mr. Emil P. Berg is a voluminous writer, and he writes on a wide range of subjects. Through Mr. Arthur H. Stockwell he has just published three new volumes (3s. net each). Their titles are *The Conversion of India*, and *The Spiritual Biography of Jesus Christ*, the latter being in two volumes, one dealing with the Primitive Gospel, and the other with the Fourth Gospel.

The cry used to be 'Back to Christ'; it is now 'Back to Paul.' We who believed in the Apostle, believed, that is to say, that he was a Christian and not a Pauline, always knew that the return would come. At the opening of this year, 1912, there are as many volumes on Paul and his Epistles as there are on Christ and the Gospels. That is excessive, but it is significant. Of these volumes the most surprising is Dr. James Drummond's. Its title is *Paul, his Life and Teaching* (S.S.A.; 1s. 6d. net). For Dr. Drummond is a unitarian, a unitarian of whom unitarians are proud, and whom they are glad to follow; and yet the Pauline theology and the Pauline Christ of Dr. James Drummond are ours, they are the Pauline theology and the Pauline Christ of the centuries of Christianity. There may be explanations and reservations here and there, but they do not touch the central substance.

To the 'Theological Translation Library,' Messrs. Williams & Norgate have added a translation of Eucken's *The Truth of Religion* (12s. 6d. net). The translation has been done by Mr. W. Tudor Jones, Ph.D. It is a handsome volume of over 600 pages. No doubt the subscribers to the 'Theological Translation Library' are heartily rejoiced to receive it, and will count it the chief ornament of that series. The translation has been made from the second and revised edition of the German original, and Professor Eucken has written a preface to it.

The translator speaks of the difficulty of his work. It is not that Professor Eucken is a bad

writer of German; the difficulty is due to the fact that the book is partly religious and partly philosophical, and something like a new terminology had to be found to express the combination of these elements. Not only so, but there is a good deal of movement at present in religious, and yet more in philosophical, terminology. The old words are slipping their moorings. And if that is true of English as well as of German words, it is easy to see that the translator's task was not an enviable one. He has striven to convey Professor Eucken's meaning in ordinary intelligible English, and for the most part he has succeeded, although occasionally he has been compelled to resort to the use of the hyphen, offering a combination of words of foreign feature.

Professor Eucken's preface is brief and effective. He urges that his first desire is to show that the spirit in man is not a single faculty, but the whole of man. It is disastrous to divide the man into body, soul, and spirit and confine the religious interest to the third part of him. When it is seen that the spiritual life is a whole, it then becomes evident that that life is not each man's exclusive possession, but that it is part of a universal life, a cosmic depth. It is only when this is revealed to a man that spiritual creativeness, art and science, morality and right, can develop and transform him. A man's religion is his own, yet not his own; it is both characteristic and universal. And it is in living relationship to these two and their mutual influence that religion shapes itself into greatness for him, and through him for the whole human race.

Contributions and Comments.

Note on Ecclus. vii. 25.

In Dr. Oesterley's article on Ben-Sira (*International Journal of the Apocrypha*, January 1912) there is a valuable observation; it is that in 25^{16} 'the wickedness of a woman changes [correct *makes ugly*] her appearance, and darkens her face like a bear,' the 'bear,' דב (?), of the 'Original Hebrew' is the equivalent of the Greek ἄρκος; which is a corruption of the Greek σάκκος which is found in some MSS.; as also in the Syriac and Latin. The corruption of ΩΣΣΑΚΚΟΣ into ΩΣΑΡΚΟΣ is easily explicable; scribes frequently write a single for a double letter, whence comes ΩΣΑΚΚΟΣ; the next copyist in order to make an intelligible word emends ΩΣΑΡΚΟΣ.

But to the present writer it seems *miraculous* that so good a scholar as Dr. Oesterley does not draw the inference which is obvious. How can the 'Original Hebrew' embody corruptions *arising in a Greek translation made some generations later*? It would be easier for the Thames at its source to show matter brought down by the Lea. Hence this just observation of Dr. Oesterley by itself proves what no scholar should ever have doubted for a day—namely, that the 'Original Hebrew' is a late and bad retranslation from the versions which we possess.

One of the few writers on this subject who appears capable of reasoning correctly, Professor Nestle, argued that some of the restorations were so felicitous that we could not credit a medieval Jew with making them. One example was in 7^{25}:

Greek, ἔκδου θυγατέρα καὶ ἔσῃ τετελεκὼς ἔργον μέγα.
Syriac, אפק ברתא ונפוק עשוקיא.
'Original Hebrew,' הוצא בת ויצא עסק.

This particular restoration (עסק) was made and published by the present writer many years before the 'Original Hebrew' was discovered. The writer must not therefore judge of its ingenuity; what he would point out is that it is entirely erroneous.

1. The verb הוציא in Rabbinic means 'to turn a wife out,' *i.e.* divorce her; it is most unlikely that a father who gave his daughter in marriage could be said to do the same, 'turn her out.' No one (one would fancy) ever uses such an expression in this context.

2. The Greek sentiment, 'you will have accomplished a great task,' might suit modern England, but it is wholly unsuitable to those polygamous countries in which a father normally offers his daughters. The matter is an exceedingly easy one.

The Syriac sentiment, 'oppression will go out,' is not witty, but silly; possibly an American million-

aire might make a joke of this sort. The Hebrew, 'business will go out,' is pointless.

3. The syntax is anachronistic: 'You will have accomplished a great work, and give her to a prudent man.' The *giving* takes place before the great work is accomplished, not after. At least the author must have said 'only give her,' or 'provided you give her.'

The first of these objections would be got over by reading, with Fränkel, השא for הוצא; the former is the correct Rabbinic for giving away a daughter. But the second and third objections would remain. Fränkel's restoration has, however, the merit that it furnishes us with the clue to the restoration of this text, namely, the Rabbinic saying, 'when your daughter becomes nubile, manumit a slave and give her to him,' *i.e.* marry her to *any* one rather than let her remain single (B. *Pesaḥim*, 113*a*). The word for 'nubile' (בוגרת) is then the source of 'a great work' (גבורת) and 'oppression' (בגדות). We get, however, the original consonants, as usual in nine syllables with three accents:

הוצא בת והצא בוגרת ולגבר נכון תננה

The second half is easily intelligible, 'marry her to any man who is at hand'; the first is harder. This is because the verb הוציא, 'bring out,' has here a sense which is less familiar, though familiar enough in the Latin *educare*, and the Arabic *kharraja*, 'he educated and trained.' It means *to bring out from potentiality to actuality*, which in the case of the human being comes about when puberty is attained (so far as the 'threptic soul' is concerned); already Aristotle's ideas underlie men's modes of thought. The sentence then means 'rear a daughter, and let her attain nubility, and then give her to the first man on the spot.'

This advice may still be heard in Egypt and India; in the latter country it is sometimes asserted that the father who delays marriage is a murderer. But what Ben-Sira appears to mean is 'if you rear a daughter till she attain nubility, then marry her at once'; but he leaves it an open question whether she should be reared or not. And such in general was the morality of the ancient world.

The last place (before Dr. Oesterley's article) where the writer had seen a reference to the 'Original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus' was in the notes to the new papyri from Elephantine; he felt surprised till he observed that the editor offered (p. 44) the words לובר חסין תמים, *i.e.* 'fine [Arabic] clean [Turkish] *lumber* [English-American, all faintly disguised],' as *Aramaic of the fifth century* B.C.! Clearly the study of the Semitic languages has not yet advanced very far.

D. S. Margoliouth.

Oxford.

John vii. 38, 39.

I.

The appearance of my friend Mr. Abrahams' very interesting paper on Jn $7^{38.39}$ in your last number, tempts me to suggest a view which I have long held, but which I fear may not be quite an orthodox one. I think that in it we may have the misapprehension of a Semitic word.

We may assume that our Lord, when He cried with a loud voice in the Temple court, spoke to the people in some form of Aramaic, probably in the dialect known to us as Palestinian Syriac, or Galilean (which is more akin to Hebrew than the Edessene, or literary Syriac, in which the Old Syriac Gospels are written).

Only a few days ago I was reading a metaphysical treatise in an Arabic text of the tenth century, and I found the word *bâṭin*, which is the present participle or 'noun agent' of a well-known Semitic verb, used in a metaphorical sense to mean something moral or spiritual, the inner consciousness, or more plainly, 'the heart.' Now, how easily this word might be mistaken by one of our Lord's hearers for *baṭn*, κοιλία! The verb, whose roots are *beth*, *teth*, and *nun*, has, it is true, somewhat different shades of meaning in the three allied Semitic languages, but there is no doubt that its noun in Hebrew sometimes did mean 'heart.'

True, we have not yet found *beṭen* used for 'heart' in the Palestinian Aramaic dialect, as it certainly is in Hebrew (see Pr 18^{18} and the lexicon), but the literature of that Aramaic Doric is so scanty that almost every newly found text enriches its vocabulary, so that we can hardly publish the contents of any of its MSS. without appending a glossary to our book. Therefore we may almost assume that any very common Hebrew verb may be assimilated to, and incorporated in, a Palestinian Syriac text quite easily, and without any violence being done to it.

That our Lord spake in this particular dialect, or *patois*, there can be no manner of doubt. Did He

not say on the Cross, 'lamà sabachthani,' when, if He had spoken in literary Syriac, it would have sounded like 'lemana shabaqthani.' The 'lamà sabachthani' is found exactly so spelt in my *Codex Climaci Rescriptus*, which, being probably of the sixth century, is certainly the oldest text of the Gospels in that dialect as yet extant.

Modern Arabs use the word *baṭn* continually for 'inside.' The plum is in the *baṭn* of the tart; the raisin is in the *baṭn* of the pudding; the scissors are in the *baṭn* of your workbag, etc. etc. A still better example of the use of *bâṭin* in Arabic has just appeared. It occurs in my metaphysical treatise, in a rendering of Jn 2^{25}, 'And did not need that any man should testify to him about any man; for he knew all that was within (*bâṭin*) all men.'

I submit this to your readers as a plausible explanation of the passage. What I suggest is, that possibly our Lord used a Hebrew Aramaic word for καρδία, and that it was quite pardonably mistaken for κοιλία. AGNES SMITH LEWIS.

Cambridge.

II.

Will you kindly allow me to say a few words in corroboration of Mr. Abrahams' valuable exposition of Jn $7^{38.\ 39}$? The first time that Mrs. Lewis and I were at Jerusalem, we went to see the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the first thing our Coptic dragoman pointed out in its interior was a stone which he said was *the centre of the earth, where Adam's skull was found.* This information is not given in Murray's *Handbook*, and did not predispose us to believe in the other sacred spots, which are more credible, but are still much disputed. Ten years ago, I edited and translated an Arabic treatise, *Kitâl-ab Magall*, or *The Book of the Rolls* (*Studia Sinaitica*, No. viii.), which professes to be a hidden book of St. Clement the Apostle, disciple of Simon Cepha, which St. Clement commanded to be kept secret from the laity. It contains amongst much other curious lore the *Testament of Adam*, in which Adam is made to say to Seth, 'When I die, embalm my body with myrrh and cassia, and put it in the Cave of Treasures of the holy hill, that thou mayst tell whosoever of thy posterity that is alive at the time when your exit shall take place from this holy Paradise-encircled hill, to carry my body with him, and go with it to the centre of the earth, and put it there, and in that place salvation shall come to me and to all my children' (*Stud. Sin.* No. viii. p. 13). On page 26, we find the dying Methusaleh saying to his grandson Noah, 'When death comes to thee, make thy testament to thy son Shem. Command him to carry the body of our father Adam, and to bury it in the middle of the earth.' The body is taken by Noah into the ark, and after the Deluge removed from it by Shem, and with the help of Melchizedek and an Angel guide carried to a place where the Angel commands them to put it down, 'for this is the centre of the earth.' . . . 'The earth was cleft for him as a door, and the body was let down into it. . . . When the body rested in its place, the earth returned and covered it over. The place was called *Gumgumah* (Arabice, *a skull*), because in it was put the skull of the Father of mankind' (pp. 32, 33). Shem then tells Melchizedek that he is the priest of the Everlasting God, and that God had chosen him from the rest of men to minister before Him before the body of our father Adam. There can thus be no doubt that the place meant is Jerusalem. Whether this story is got from the Talmud or not, Mr. Abrahams can say; but it is evidently current amongst Eastern Christians.

De Lagarde says of *The Book of the Rolls*, that though it may be worthless in itself, it is the source from which many authors have drawn; it runs in Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic through the churches of Asia and Africa. Dr. Nöldeke thinks that the story dates from the sixth century. I should be inclined to class it with the 'fables' which St. Paul warns Timothy to avoid. Yet it is interesting to find that it confirms Mr. Abrahams' theory that our Lord was referring to Jerusalem as the reputed *middle of the earth.* MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

III.

It is interesting to observe that in the Catacomb and many other representations of Christ in early Rome and Ravenna (cf. Smith and Cheetham for illustrations), out of the Rock on which *the Lamb is seated*, there flow four streams (Gospels = Chrysostom) into the River of Baptism, which flows from the mystic city of Bethlehem to that of Jerusalem. Is this a primitive recollection of the original text of Jn 7? It seems like it.

I have the only instance of the full idea (part of

it appears on the seal of the Church House, in St. John's, Wilton Road, and in a church in Brussels) outside of North Italy over the south-west porch of my church, copied in substance from the great fresco over the atrium of S. Paolo-fuori-le-Mura, Rome.

FREDERIC RELTON.

St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington.

The Meaning of Matthew xi. 16–19.

WHAT is the point of our Lord's comparison between the children playing in the market-places and 'this generation' in Mt 11^{16-19} = Lk 7^{31-35}? On p. 216 of the second edition of his *Synopsis*, Dr. Arthur Wright says that in this case 'breviloquentia has led to confusion.' His reasons for seeing this confusion are that our Lord and John are like the children that speak and propose to play, the One at a wedding, the other at a funeral; and that Jesus really meant 'this generation' to be 'like the mass of children who are silent and sulk, refusing to do either.'

But if we agree with Dr. Sanday that 'the immediate purpose of this passage is to rebuke the perverse and shallow judgments which the world is apt to pass upon those who try to reform it,' it seems unnecessary to assume either the confusion or Dr. Wright's reasons for seeing it. Indeed, the point and the parallelism make it probable that the children who first complain because their fellows would not dance, and then because they would not mourn, correspond to that generation. If this is so, the order of the explanation is significant. First, 'John came neither eating nor drinking,' and they are not satisfied. They complain that he will not 'dance.' In other words, they say that he has a devil because he is an ascetic, and lives in the wilderness. Then 'the Son of man came eating and drinking.' And Him also they judged and condemned. This time their complaint was that Jesus would not 'mourn.' They were annoyed and offended because our Lord did not live apart from society and sinners. It was therefore the perversity and inconsistency of these men who would follow neither the Baptist nor the Christ that our Lord compared with the complaints and the changeableness of children at play.

CAVENDISH MOXON.

South Croydon.

Watering with the Foot.

THE two interesting descriptions of irrigation in the East lately given to explain Dt 11^{10} seem wide of the difficulty in the passage. Irrigation as described may be troublesome, but in the passage it is evidently downright hardship.

The expression 'wateredst it with thy foot' is surely figurative. By synecdoche the singular is put for the plural, and part for the whole. Carrying the water required to irrigate the land after sowing was extremely fatiguing to the whole body, but the part that suffered most was the feet. Watering the land, the people became footsore.

The purpose and advantage of the figure seem obvious. It fixes attention in the most definite manner on the part where the hardship was felt most painfully, and serves for all the greater contrast between the land of Egypt and the land about to be possessed.

J. A. WILSON.

Isleham, Cambs.

The Age of Joseph.

WITH reference to Professor A. H. Sayce's article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, January 1912, where he states (p. 168–9), 'In Egypt, on the contrary, where the Babylonian sexagesimal system was not in use, the normal age of man reckoned at 110 years,' it might be interesting to note that, in Gn 50^{26}, Joseph died in Egypt at 110 years.

M. GASTER.

London.

Shalmaneser.

I HAVE been exceedingly interested in the paper by my friend Professor Langdon on 'Pir-idri (Ben-Hadad) King of Syria' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, November 1911, pp. 68, 69). It has convinced me that the Ben-Hadad of 2 K 8^{7-15} is Pir-idri. I had, of course, read long ago Zimmern's closely reasoned paper in the Hilprecht Anniversary Volume, pp. 299–303, but without being quite carried, though it did suffice to shake my former view. I am writing now, however, to point out that the king whom we have hitherto called Shalmaneser II. (859–825 B.C.) must now be designated Shalmaneser III. It is quite true that in the plates of *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, historischen Inhalts* (Leipzig, 1911), by the lamented

Leopold Messerschmidt, to which Professor Langdon makes reference, the king is still designated 'Salmanassar II.,' but the name is correctly given 'Salmanassar III.' in the Verzeichniss, p. x, which Professor Delitzsch prefixed to Messerschmidt's plates. The facts are that in April 1909 the German expedition at Asshur had the good fortune to find a five-line inscription of a king Shalmaneser which runs as follows:

Ṣa-lam
(m, ilu) Šulmanu-ašaridu
šarru rabû šar kiššat šar (mât) Aššûr
apal Ašur-nâsir-aplu šar (mât) Aššûr
apal Šam-ši-Adad šar (mât) Aššûr-ma.[1]

This is to be translated as follows:

PORTRAIT
of Shalmaneser
the great king, king of the world, king of Assyria
son of Ashurnazirpal, king of Assyria
son of Shamshi-Adad, king of Assyria.

Now the interest of this little text lies in this, that it gives us the names of a hitherto unknown Shalmaneser, and enables us to relate him chronologically with perfect certainty. We now have the order:

Tiglathpileser I., *circa* 1120 B.C.
Ashur-bel-kala, his son
Shamshi-Adad III., also son of Tiglathpileser
Ashurnazirpal I., grandson of Tiglathpileser
Shalmaneser II., son of Ashurnazirpal I.

This, of course, requires us to change the hitherto well-known king Shalmaneser II., who is the son of Ashurnazirpal II. and grandson of Tukulti-Ninib II., to Shalmaneser III.[2]

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

Madison, New Jersey.

The First Prayer in the Bible.

IN the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' I read (*Genesis to Numbers*, p. 234) on Gn $32^{10.11}$:

> 'After receiving the threatening report about Esau, Jacob retired to the privacy of his tent and poured forth the acknowledgment of his trouble and perplexity *in the first-recorded words of human prayer*. They are words which tell the want and vibrate with the passion of a human heart. "I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth, which thou hast showed to thy servant. . . . Deliver me, I pray thee, from the hand of my brother."'

When I read this, it struck me as a beautiful thought, that the very first prayer agreed with the apostle's demand (Ph 4^{6}): 'In nothing be anxious; but in everything by prayer and supplication with *thanksgiving* let your *requests* be made known to God.' Or with the admonition of the old Tobit (4^{19}): '*Bless* (in the German translation: *Thank* to) the Lord thy God always, and *desire* of him that thy ways may be directed, and that all thy paths and counsels may prosper.' But then the question arose: Are these the very first recorded words of human prayer? And thinking of Gn 24^{12} 'O LORD God of my master Abraham, I pray thee, send me good speed this day, etc.,' and of v.^{27}, 'Blessed be the LORD God of my master Abraham, who has not left destitute my master of his mercy and his truth etc.,' I should like to ask, how Gn $32^{10.11}$ may be called not the first-recorded prayer of Jacob, but the first-recorded words of human prayer.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

A LYRICAL poem on the text 'The Sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair' opens a volume, by John Presland, and gives the name to it—*The Deluge, and other Poems* (Chatto & Windus). But that text is beyond the author's comprehension. There is a better vision in this poem on Consolation, though it just misses the best vision of all.

CONSOLATION.

'Is there a pain to match my pain
In all this world of woe;
When to and fro on a barren earth
My weary footsteps go?
When no day's sun shall give me mirth
And no stars blessed be;
Because my heart goes hungry and lone
For one who turns from me?'

Hear what the voice of all Sorrows saith
From out the ages dim:
'As melt the snows your passion goes,
And as dew it vanisheth.
Take up, take up your burden of woe,
Unblenching on your journey go,
For man was born to reap and sow
That earth might fruitful be.'

'Is there a pain to match my pain,
Who watch the small dead face,
With the folded lips, and the folded lids,
And the cheek the dimples grace;
Where they will come again no more, no more?—
Oh, small soft hands that hold
So quietly, in rosy palms,
My heart that's dead and cold.'

Hear what the voice of all Sorrows saith:
'Though still the little feet,
Though the hands are chill, and the sweet form
chill,
And gone the childish breath;
Take up, take up your burden of woe,
For you were born to sorrow so,
To bear in anguish, and lose in pain,
That earth might be fulfilled.'

'Is there a pain to match my pain
Who loved all men on earth,
Who saw the Godhead, through the shell
That burdened them at birth;
Who strove for right, who strove for good,
Since love must win at last?
—This hour they lead me out to die,
With cords they make me fast.'

Hear what the voice of all Sorrows saith:
'They lead you out to die;
For the love you gave they will dig your
grave,
And their thanks to you is death.
Take up, take up your burden of woe,
And proudly to your scaffold go,
For men were born to suffer so,
That mankind might be great.'

It may be that a poem taken out of its setting in a college magazine loses a little of its flavour. But there is something still refreshing in *The Don and the Dervish* (Dent; 3s. 6d. net), a book of verse which Professor R. A. Nicholson has gathered chiefly out of the *Cambridge Review*. It is not easily quotable, but this may serve:

To Zoilus.

Be you, my critic *comme il faut*,
Smooth-tongued, sharp-witted.
Johnson, I grant you, was not so,
Who dumped, alike on friend and foe,
The cap that fitted.

To-day a milder orb illumes,
Sweetness expressing,
Our literary drawing-rooms:
Ferocity itself assumes
An air of blessing.

Oh, never call a spade a spade,
A yard a measure!
The bitterest truth can be conveyed
Politely, if one's not afraid
Of giving pleasure.

From *Poems in Various Moods for Various Ages*, by Francis Seymour Stevenson (Jarrold; 2s. net), let us select as a fair example this poem:

On the Statue of Sir Thomas Browne, at Norwich.

Master of thoughts, whose word-embodied flight,
Soaring with angels' wings athwart the sky,
Transcends the range of man's untutored sight,
Yet bears the germs of wisdom from on
high;
Ne'er may, the while time's chariots onward roll,
'Iniquitous oblivion's poppy-seeds'
Be scattered o'er the garden of thy soul,
And choke its verdure's radiancy with weeds!

So may this bronze recall thy twofold aim,
To heal the ills and errors of mankind!
The same Afflatus moulds, in space and time,
The human intellect, the human frame;
For matter is but mind, crass, unrefined,
And mind is matter, purified, sublime.

When a volume of poems is part sacred and part secular, the sacred is nearly always better than the

secular. Yet we will quote one of the sacred poems in Dora Bee's *The Lord is King* (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net).

O Thou that Knowest.

O Thou that knowest best,
For me provide.
My way is hedged with thorns, my heart oppressed,
I need a Guide!
I have Thy gracious purposes withstood,
But Thou art good.

O Thou that hold'st me up,
Not once nor twice
Has disappointment overflowed my cup,
And dimmed my eyes.
Make Thou Thy holy will henceforth my meat,
For it is sweet.

O Thou Whose love is strong,
I lie as clay
Marred in Thine hand by wilful deeds of wrong,
Not cast away.
Remould me, till a vessel Thou produce,
Meet for Thy use.

O Thou that calmest fears,
And soothest pain,
Restore the many locust-eaten years
To me again.
Follow my stumbling footsteps where I roam,
And take me home.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. F. Warburton Lewis, B.A., Epworth, Aberystwyth, and the Rev. R. Strong, M.A., Leeds.

Illustrations for the Great Text for March must be received by the 1st of February. The text is Ro 15^{4}.

The Great Text for April is Is 30^{15}—'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.' A copy of Professor Clarke's *The Ideal of Jesus*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for May is Is $40^{6\text{-}8}$—'The voice of one saying, Cry. And one said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our Lord shall stand for ever.' A copy of Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, or Oswald Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for June is Is $53^{1.\ 2}$—'Who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.' A copy of Agnew's *Life's Christ Places*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for July is Ro $1^{3.\ 4}$—'Concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of MacCulloch's *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, or of Curtis's *A History of Creeds and Confessions*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE fourth volume of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS has been published, and now a third of the work is in our hands. These four volumes have all been issued within four years, which is just half the length of time it took to publish the same number of volumes of *The Dictionary of the Bible*. And yet there is more matter in each volume of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, and more work on the part of the contributors and the editors. But the editors' staff is now larger; and fuller experience produces quicker as well as better results.

How is an Encyclopædia made? First of all the need for it has to be realized. Next a clear conception has to be formed in the mind of the editor. He has to determine what is to be the character of the work, and what its scope. Then a list of the topics to be included in it has to be prepared. In the case of a Dictionary of the Bible it is easy enough to prepare a list of topics. There are dictionaries in existence, and all that a new editor has to do is to work over the best of them, and see whether any of the entries are unnecessary, and whether any entries are awanting; more especially whether recent scholarship has brought any topics to the front which were not recognized before. That is comparatively plain sailing. In the case of THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS, the editor was confronted with the serious fact that there was no such work in existence. No one apparently had conceived the idea of bringing all religion within the compass of one book. Where were the subjects found?

They were found at first in books. A whole library of books was ransacked for them, and a first tentative list was made out. This list was then separated into parts. Out of it were formed a Semitic and Egyptian list, a Christian list, a Buddhist list, a Muhammadan list, a Greek and Roman list, a Persian list, a Primitive list. Of each of these lists copies were made, and these copies were sent to men who were authorities in the particular department of study. A copy of the Semitic list was sent to Driver, one to Nöldeke, to Goldziher, Sayce, Barton, Paton, Pinches, and others. Copies of the Buddhist list were similarly sent to Buddhist scholars; and so with all the rest. An Ethical and Psychological list was also made out separately and sent to Baldwin, Dorner, Eucken, Iverach, Lloyd Morgan, Paulsen, Sorley, Royce, Arthur Thomson, and others. When these men received their copy, they went over it, scoring out redundancies, supplying deficiencies, marking words they wished to write upon, suggesting authors for other topics.

These lists returned, the editor went over them, one by one and word by word. He brought them

together again, and made out a comprehensive list, covering the whole field of Religion and Ethics. But there was still much to do and many books to read before the list was complete and ready for the assigning of the articles to their authors. When, however, it was ready, the most difficult step in the making of the Encyclopædia was accomplished.

In finding authors for the articles the editor was greatly indebted to the individual lists which had been returned. Altogether this part of the work proved easier than had been anticipated. The best men were found willing to undertake such subjects as fell within their province. No man was invited to take up anything that he had not already studied. It may be noticed that in the four volumes now issued, a considerable proportion of the writers contribute but one article. The founder of the Church Army is an authority on the Church Army and nothing else. The founder of Christian Endeavour is an authority on Christian Endeavour. And when more than one article comes from one contributor the range is strictly defined. Professor De Groot touches nothing that is not Chinese; Professor Nöldeke will not move beyond the bounds of Ancient Arabia.

When an article arrives it is submitted to 'preparation for the press.' At this stage what is known as the 'blue pencil' is in evidence, sometimes much in evidence, sometimes, however, very little. For there are men who were born to write in encyclopædias: they write clearly and yet succinctly; they arrange their matter in the best order, they themselves suggest the passages that may be thrown into small type. There are other men, however, who are not born to do these things and never learn to do them. After the blue pencil has done its work, the article is typewritten and several copies of the typescript are taken. A copy is sent to the author, who goes over it with interest and returns it,—sometimes with remarks. A copy is also read by each of five editors. The corrections made on all these copies are then transferred to one copy, which is sent to press. The article has at last reached the hands of the printer.

Eight copies are made of what is called the 'first proof.' The author receives two; he reads and returns one, and retains the other for reference. The editors read their copies. Again the whole is transferred to one copy and sent back to the printer. The next proof is in page form. The same process of reading is gone over again and the pages are returned to the printer. This is done three or four times, in some cases five or six times, before the sheet is finally passed for printing off.

But what does the proof-reading on the part of the editors mean? It means in the case of The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics the reading of every word in the article with the most scrupulous care. It means the verifying of every reference and every quotation contained in it. For although the author is chosen as the greatest authority on the subject, his work is read on the supposition that he is fallible. Every statement that he makes is subjected to scrutiny; every man's name, the title of every book, every date and place of publication is submitted to independent verification. Errors which can be corrected by the means at the editors' disposal are corrected, the author, of course, seeing the correction that is made and accepting it. When a reference cannot be verified and there is the least suspicion of its correctness, the author's attention is in every case drawn to it, and the sheet is kept till the editor is satisfied. For an Encyclopædia which cannot be trusted in matters of fact is not worth publishing.

Three things are kept steadily before the editors' minds: first, the aim of the work; next, its reliability; lastly, its readability. Of the first two something has been said; the last is worth a sentence or two also. A reviewer of the first volume (it was that acute scholar who contributes a literary article every week to *The Methodist*

Recorder) remarked humorously that there were authors in it who never wrote so well before. For the editor holds that it is time the reproach of unreadableness were removed from encyclopædias. The articles are condensed, but a condensed article should be more easily and more agreeably read than a profuse or prolix article. It depends upon simple things. Are the sentences complete, the syntax correct, the paragraphs in order, the style characteristic of the author and suitable to the theme? In short, is it really good idiomatic English? The editor has counted it part of his business to see that it is. And, greatest triumph of all, the translations are indistinguishable from original English writing.

What is the use of this Encyclopædia? What is its use to a preacher?

It contains all that a preacher has to preach. It contains all the Christian doctrine, and all the Christian ethics. It sets aside as unnecessary a whole library of books through which the preacher has to wade in order to know what the message of the gospel is and how that message may be proclaimed with most power. It makes vague notions definite—vague notions of Christ and Christianity, of faith and love, of individual responsibility, of fellowship with God and man. It makes wrong-thinking right, and it brings all right-thinking into order.

But the Encyclopædia does more for the man than for the preacher. Before we can preach we must *be*. Men who have passed the prime of their life are afraid of this Encyclopædia. Their doctrine is determined long ago. They may find difficulty in making it interesting now from day to day, but they cannot change it. For change in the doctrine means first of all change in the man. The whole religious outlook has altered within a generation, and a man who is past fifty must be changed in his whole mental equipment to understand and to make use of it. Words like 'psychology' and 'sociology' mark the change somewhat, but there is no word which marks it as does the word 'religion.'

In the *Ethics of the Dust*, RUSKIN has a passage which gives promise of that spring which he scarcely saw even as spring and which only now is passing into summer. He introduces it with the anecdote (which he tells us in the preface is true) of the child of three whose friend had gone abroad. 'The morning after Alice had gone, Dotty was very sad and restless when she got up, and went about, looking into all the corners, as if she could find Alice in them, and at last she came to me, and said, "Is Alie gone over the great sea?" And I said, "Yes, she is gone over the great, deep sea, but she will come back again some day." Then Dotty looked round the room; and I had just poured some water out into the basin; and Dotty ran to it, and got up on a chair, and dashed her hands through the water, again and again; and cried, "Oh, deep, deep sea! send little Alie back to me!"'

Says RUSKIN: 'The whole heart of Greek mythology is in that; the idea of a personal being in the elemental power;—of its being moved by prayer; and of its presence everywhere, making the broken diffusion of the element sacred.'

What leads him to tell this anecdote? It is the discovery, which RUSKIN may not have been the first and certainly has not been the last to make, that the more definite our own faith is, we are the more ready to appreciate the faith of others; the more firmly we grasp the facts and principles of our own religion, the more do we see the necessity of understanding what religion means to other nations. 'I assure you,' he says, 'strange as it may seem, our scorn of Greek tradition depends, not on our belief, but our disbelief, of our own traditions.' And again, 'Do not think you will ever get harm by striving to enter into the faith of others, and to sympathize, in imagina-

tion, with the guiding principles of their lives. So only can you justly love them, or pity them, or praise.'

No doubt to the preacher who lives from hand to mouth, RUSKIN and Religion are together both barred and banned. God forgive him and us that any preacher should have to live from hand to mouth. Certain it is that such preaching must be nothing, of no more efficacy for the coming of the Kingdom than the twittering of the sparrows on the church roof. If the preaching is to be anything, the man must be more than the preacher. In short, he must be a man of God, fully furnished unto every good work. And this THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS seeks to do for him.

It is some time since we had a volume of the series which goes by the name of 'American Lectures on the History of Religions.' The best known volumes of the series are Brinton's *Primitive Religions* and Cheyne's *Life after the Exile*. The new volume is on Babylonia and Assyria, its exact title being *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria* (Putnam; 9s. net). Its author is Professor MORRIS JASTROW, Jun., Ph.D., of the University of Pennsylvania.

Throughout the volume, which is a substantial octavo of nearly 500 pages, there runs a distinction which is new in the study of Babylonian and Assyrian religion, although it is of the utmost importance. It is the distinction between the religion of the people and the religion of the priests. Perhaps we might express the distinction roughly by saying that the religion of the people was religion mixed with magic, while the religion of the priests was religion modified by theological speculation. It is a distinction which is seen most clearly in the views that were held of the state of the dead. And the moment we see how unmistakable is the distinction in Babylonia, we are compelled to ask whether there was not a like distinction in Israel.

We are compelled to ask if the Book of Ecclesiastes, for example, tells us what was passing through the minds of the people of Israel. Professor JASTROW does not think it does. He thinks that we are nearer the mind of the people when we read the story of the witch of Endor than when we pursue the religious speculations of the Preacher. But the distinction is more difficult to make in Israel than among the Babylonians. In Israel we have little besides the Bible to work with, and we cannot tell very easily how much of the Bible is folk-belief and how much priestly modification. But in Babylonia there are texts and tablets of unadulterated folk-lore, so that the two forms of religion can be separated and set side by side.

It was the belief of the people of Babylonia that, after this life has come to an end, men and women continue to exist in a conscious or semi-conscious state. It is not an enviable condition. The dead are condemned to inactivity, and it is an inactivity that carries with it the loss of all that has made life worth living. Deep down in the bowels of the earth they are huddled together in a cave. The place is dark, gloomy, and damp. In one poetic work it is described as a neglected and forlorn palace where dust has been allowed to gather. There are slight modifications of this belief. The dwelling-place of the dead is sometimes pictured as a great city, and sometimes, curiously enough, as if it were the temple of a god. But whatever the name or metaphor used, all the sources emphasize the darkness and gloom of the abode of the dead. It is just such a place as Job has in mind when he says (10^{22}) that there even 'the light is as darkness.' Nor is there any return from it. Once and again the shade of some dead man may rise up to earth in order to trouble the living. But it is only to return, after a short visit, to that land of darkness from which there is no escape for ever.

This was the belief of the people, and all their belief; it was not all the belief of the priests. By

speculation, or revelation if you will; by contact, perhaps, in later years with foreign thinking, the priests of Babylonia had reached at least the faint inkling of a view that the gods were actuated by justice and mercy, and that they could not condemn all alike to a fate so sad as eternal confinement in a dark cave. Besides *Aralû*, the abode of gloom, there was also, they came to believe, an 'Island of the Blest,' situated at the confluence of the streams to which those were carried who had won the favour of the gods. Ut-Napishtim, the Babylonian Noah, had won the favour of the gods. When the rest of mankind were destroyed in the Deluge, Ut-Napishtim and his wife were carried to this island by Ea, the god of humanity, and together continued there to lead a life not unlike that of the immortal gods.

These favourites of the gods, however, were excessively few. This is a great and unaccountable surprise. The kings of Babylonia were not sent to the 'Island of the Blest.' The priests themselves do not seem to have found their way thither. Like the kings and heroes of the Greek epic, they all pass together to the land of no return, to the dark and dismal dwelling far below the earth. An exception is not made even in the case of kings like Sargon, or Naram-Sin of Akkad, or Dungi of the Ur dynasty, although these kings have the sign for deity attached to their names and had temples dedicated in their honour just like the gods. Professor JASTROW thinks that the explanation of this may be that the divinity of the Babylonian kings was a political and not a religious prerogative. The head of the State was identified, as it were, with the tutelary god. As soon as he ceased to be head of the State the identification ceased; he became a mere man, and passed to where almost all mere men go.

There is one remarkable thing about the ideas which the Babylonians had regarding the state of the dead. Whether it was popular belief or priestly speculation, no ethical ingredient seems ever to have entered into it. Never once is it hinted in the religious literature of Babylonia or Assyria that the life lived on earth had anything to do with the condition of the life after death. Never once is it suggested that the wicked will find a retribution or the good a reward. There is no figure in Babylonian or Assyrian religion like the Osiris of the Egyptian religion, that judge of the dead who weighs the good deeds against the bad in order to decide the destiny of the soul. While a man is alive he is expected to do everything in his power by confession of sin and by elaborate expiatory rite to secure the favour of the gods or appease their anger. But all his hopes are centred upon earthly happiness and present success. The gods have an interest in the living; with the dead they have no concern.

And so we find that if, once in a way, a man or woman is carried after death to the 'Island of the Blest,' it is not on the ground of character or conduct. In the Bible we find Noah, like Job, spoken of as perfect and righteous, and that is the explanation of his escape from the Flood. But in Babylonian literature no such encomium is passed on Ut-Napishtim, of whom the utmost that is said is that he was 'a very clever one.'

Is this not the essential difference between the religion of Babylonia and the religion of Israel? Professor JASTROW thinks it is. 'Had an ethical factor been introduced, in however faint a degree, we should have found,' he says, 'a decided modification of the primitive views in regard to the fate of the dead. Perhaps there might have been a development not unlike that which took place among the Hebrews, who, starting from the same point as the Babylonians and Assyrians, reached the conclusion that a god of justice and mercy extended his protection to the dead as well as to the living, and that those who suffered injustice in this world would find a compensatory reward in the next.'

Dr. Edward Carus SELWYN, the author of *St. Luke the Prophet* and other books like it, has

published yet another and a larger volume, to which he has given the title of *The Oracles in the New Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net).

It is a book of incessant provocation. We do not mean that it always provokes unto love and to good works; but it always provokes to thinking. There is perhaps not one single page of the book with which the student of the Gospels will be wholly in agreement. But there must be very few pages that do not make him stop to think again.

For example. Dr. SELWYN is discussing the date of Christ's birth. Following St. Luke, he maintains that the Nativity took place at the time when Quirinius was *legatus* of Syria, in 6 A.D. There is nothing, he says, in Luke which conflicts with this statement. But what, then, will he do with Lk 3^{23}?

Take the reading of that verse according to WESTCOTT and HORT: 'And Jesus himself when he began was about thirty years of age, being the son, as was supposed, of Joseph.' What is the meaning of 'when he began'? The Revisers say the meaning is, when He began to teach. But that is a mere supposition; and it is scarcely possible, if that had been the meaning, that the words 'to teach' would have been omitted. Dr. SELWYN follows BLASS.

Now BLASS is not satisfied with 'when he began to teach,' and he is not satisfied with 'when he began.' 'When he began,' he says, is unintelligible. Following CLEMENT he changes one letter of one word (ἀρχόμενος into ἐρχόμενος), and then he gets the translation 'coming' in place of 'when he began.' But coming to what? Coming to the Baptism, says CLEMENT. This is CLEMENT'S supposition. And it is just as difficult to believe that 'coming' could be written for 'coming to the Baptism,' as that 'when he began' could be written for 'when he began to teach.'

Let us keep to 'coming.' It might be rendered 'he that cometh.' Now 'he that cometh' is a prophetic term of the Messiah. There is no article with it, just as there is no article with the word for Messiah (χριστός) itself. Luke was fully aware of it as a technical term. It is part of the question which the Baptist sent his disciples to put to Jesus; and it is found in the Hosanna cry: 'Blessed is he that cometh.'

Whereupon we read the verse: 'Now Jesus himself was the coming one'—and the difficulty about the chronology disappears.

'If thou wilt thou canst.' These are the two attributes of God which seem to the popular mind to be for ever in conflict. At the present time it is His power that is in doubt. We have had the Divine Fatherhood so often and so eloquently recommended to us; we have so often been told that 'like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth'—not them that fear Him only, but all mankind, that we have come to believe that God is a God of good intention. But what is to be said of the pain and the poverty that are in the world? We read that it is not the will of our Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish. We come to the conclusion that His will is good but He has not the power to make it prevail.

Some time ago, say about the time of the Reformation, it was all the other way. God was a potter; men were the clay in His hands. He had issued His decrees and was daily executing them in the works of creation and providence. The familiar texts were taken from the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans: 'For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then

unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?'

Go back another step. In the days of our Lord the will and the power of God were in harmony. What He desired to do that He did. But it was a disastrous harmony. For all the acts of God's providence were directed for the benefit of those in whom He was well pleased. And He was well pleased with that select number only who knew the Law and kept it. The rest—and they were almost the whole race of mankind—were outside His concern and apart from His care. 'This people who knoweth not the law are cursed.'

Jesus broke that harmony. He did not deny that the will and the work of God go together, but He compelled men to consider them separately. He stood for God. He deliberately stood to them in God's stead. When they thought of God, He demanded that they should think of Him. When they saw Him, He was surprised if they did not see God. Now as He stood there, to all appearance a man among men, it was inevitable that they should make up their minds about His attributes separately.

And it is no surprise to find that they first made up their minds about His power. 'If thou wilt thou canst.' For the evidence of His power was every day around them, and He daily drew attention to it. He insisted upon their noticing it. 'That the Son of man hath power on earth'—He thereupon cured the man of his paralysis. He even made it the final and sufficient test of faith. 'Believe ye that I am able to do this?'

For no one who acknowledged the power of God in Christ would be long in acknowledging His goodwill. 'If thou wilt thou canst.' The answer came immediately: 'I will.' And not in word only but in deed. So it was always. His daily life declared His own goodwill. He went about doing good. And so it may be said that the moment they recognized in Him the mighty power of God, that moment they knew as never before how gracious God is.

Thus to those who believed, the harmony between the attributes of God, which Christ seemed at first to destroy, was restored. And the sinner was subject of it quite as much as the saint. What consternation He must have caused among the righteous when He said, 'This man'—this publican and sinner—'went down to his house justified rather than the other'—more just in the sight of God than the just man. This outcast of God went down to his house more under the favour of God than the erstwhile exclusive favourite.

Now return for a moment to the beginning. In our own day we believe in God's goodwill, but we do not believe in His power. What do we think prevents Him from working out His will? There are two answers, the one scientific, the other philosophical.

The scientific answer is, the nature of things. The student of science does not deny the existence of God. Or, if he does, in doing so he is not a student of science. And he does not deny His benevolence. But he says that, however benevolent God may be, He is continually prevented from translating His benevolence into beneficence. He points to the struggle for existence up and down the whole scale of life. And the conclusion he comes to is that there is a nature of things that is more than God. And if it is urged that God must Himself be the author of this nature of things, he replies that then God must have found it impossible to make the world without curtailing His own omnipotence.

The answer to the man of science is, that all questions of what God might have done are philo-

sophical and not scientific questions. As a man of science he has therefore nothing to do with them. Let him attend to the nature of things. That is matter of observation and legitimate inference. Does the struggle for existence defy God's power?

What answer can we give? The answer is the acknowledgment of God in Christ. For the moment that a man recognizes God in Christ he sees, first of all, and sees clearly, that God is no respecter of persons. He sees, in the next place, that it is not the will of God that any man, woman, or child, or living creature upon earth should suffer pain or pass through sorrow. But he sees also, and this is the point, that whatever suffering there may be in the world God's goodwill is not defied; it is only delayed. There are degrees of good. And he sees that the lesser good, which is freedom from pain, is delayed only that the higher good, which is freedom from sin, may be accomplished.

The philosophical dilemma is different. God cannot always carry out His will, says the philosopher, because there is a will that is superior to His. That will is Fate.

Now there is a certain fascination in the idea of a will impersonal, impalpable, but also implacable, above the will even of the Almighty. It may not differ much, as it finds its place in the mind of man, from the scientific conception of the nature of things. But in its origin it is wholly different. It is an inheritance from the Greeks.

And yet the Greeks did not believe in it. It is a marvellous thing that after all our study of the Greek religion, after all that we have been taught so confidently about those half-personal beings, the Furies and the Fates, about that altogether impersonal but much more awful being, Fate itself, it is a marvellous thing, we say, to find that the greatest scholar of the religion of Greece should come forward now to tell us that it is all a mistake. Dr. L. R. FARNELL, the author of *The Cults of the Greek States*, has just issued a book to which he has given the title of *Greece and Babylon* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d.). It is a handsome octavo volume and very pleasant to read. Dr. FARNELL himself speaks of it as a comparative sketch of Mesopotamian, Anatolian, and Hellenic religions. Now in one of the chapters of this book he tells us what is known and may be relied upon as to the conception of God's power entertained by these peoples. And he says that neither Babylonians nor Greeks, in their uncontaminated days, ever believed in a Fate that was higher than the highest God.

They believed in Furies, they believed in Fates, but they were all in the hollow of God's hand. In Fate they did not believe. These are Dr. FARNELL'S words: 'It has often been popularly and lightly maintained that the Hellenic deities were subordinate to a power called Fate. This is a shallow misjudgment, based on a misinterpretation of a few phrases in Homer; we may be certain that the aboriginal Hellene was incapable of so gloomy an abstraction, which would sap the vitality of personal polytheism and which only appears in strength in the later periods of religious decay.'

So then, the belief in a Fate to which God Himself must bow is a purely philosophical conception, and as such the religious man has no concern with it. It is a hypothesis which he does not need, a hypothesis which no man needs; and it explains nothing. The moment that a man says, 'God be merciful,' he sees that with God all things are possible.

The Message of Rudolf Eucken.

By the Rev. J. Dick Fleming, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, and Lecturer in Philosophy, Manitoba College, Winnipeg.

Apart from his originality and vigour of thought, Eucken must be regarded as a prophet among the philosophers, with a definite and serious message for all men, and particularly for all whose function it is to teach and guide their fellows.

The chief works of the philosopher of Jena may be mentioned, first of all. They are as follows—*The Problem of Human Life, as viewed by the Great Thinkers from Plato to the Present Day* (1889)—a work of profound insight, in which, relating each master of thought to the life and conditions of his time, he seeks to reveal in each some aspect of the substantial truth; *The Truth of Religion* (1901), where he shows what religion stands for, and particularly what is the essential content of truth in Christianity; *The Currents of Present-day Thought* (1904, 3rd ed.); and finally *The Main Outlines of a New View of Life* (1907). Of these works three have been translated (the last under the title *Life's Basis and Life's Ideal*, A. & C. Black, 1911), as well as several smaller treatises (*e.g. The Life of the Spirit* in the 'Crown Theological Library,' and *Christianity and the New Idealism* in 'Harper's Library'). What facilitates the understanding of Eucken's philosophy is that, whether dealing with the history of past thought, or criticising present-day tendencies, or considering the problem of religion, he is always expounding the same central message—that all thought worthy of the name is an attempt to give expression to the life of the spirit which is in man, and yet higher than man.

It will help to clear the way for the understanding of Eucken's positive idealism if we start with his review of present-day thought and life, and his criticism of the various forms of modern culture. No one who has his eyes open to the variety of life around him will fail to notice how discordant are the voices in which men of to-day are uttering the views of the world and their practical ideals. These dissonant voices constitute a challenge to the reflective mind, indicating the crisis in which we stand and the need of some deeper solution of life's problems than has yet been reached. Eucken distinguishes five different types of mental and practical attitude, each of which is adopted by good men, and therefore needs more than a negative criticism. Of these five attitudes, two may be described as older views which, though still maintaining themselves, are being gradually pressed into the background, while the remaining three are modern and enjoy the greatest popularity and influence. The older two are the views and ideals presented on the one hand by the ordinary religious man, and on the other by the idealist philosopher. The three more modern attitudes that largely hold the field are seen in the naturalistic, the socialist, and the æsthetic individualist types of mind.

Five Types of Mind.

1. The first is the attitude of the ordinary religious man, who accepts the traditional faith of Christianity, and looks back for inspiration to the new life that came into the world in Jesus Christ. Coming to manhood in a decadent era, weary of life and despairing of any solution of the world-problems, Christianity presented itself as a refuge from evil, a religion of redemption. It taught men to surmount life's evil by lifting their thought and aspiration above the earthly existence to a supernatural life, a kingdom of God, which, invisible in its essence, becomes visible in the Church. It called men to a new world-transcending life, inviting them to find peace and blessedness in a home of the spirit far beyond the disturbing influence of the world's sin and sorrow. Christianity was, however, no onesidedly transcendent system, like that of Plotinus the neo-Platonist, or of the Indian religion, calling to a total disparagement of the earthly life and all its interests. It did not teach a mere renunciation of the world; rather it called men through the conversion of heart and life to a definite transformation of the world. History shows that Christianity has largely effected what it proclaimed and sought. It has created a new world within the old; it has exalted men to a new spiritual plane, and placed itself the mightiest force in human life. Yet we cannot be blind to the fact that from the seventeenth century onward there has

appeared a growing opposition to this type of life, not merely on the part of individuals, but of large masses of men in all the communities of Europe. We can see on what this opposition is based; and we can see how far it extends, that the opposition is not to some forms of Christianity, but to Christianity root and branch.

For one thing, modern science has tended to the dissolution of the old religious beliefs. It has done away with the old geocentric and anthropocentric point of view: the earth is no longer the centre of the universe, nor will science admit a supernatural anthropomorphic power, interfering with the order of nature.

But, further, the modern man attaches little meaning to the call to renounce the world. Such an appeal might be applicable to the earlier ages of Christendom when men were world-weary and glad to abandon all earthly interests. But to-day these interests have broadened and deepened; science and art, business and statecraft call forth man's highest powers, and elicit an intense interest in the immediately present. There is now a keen and wholesome affirmation of life, an uplifting joy in contending with nature's powers and secrets, and wresting these to human uses. And to those who throw themselves with zest into such interests, the religious point of view seems tame and ineffective, its appeal to other-worldliness meaningless, its save-your-soul attitude narrow and paltry. Even with those who still cling to the old religious faith, there is no longer the old strong and assured confidence; and faith, instead of being the triumphant support and inspiration of life, has itself to be earnestly upheld and battled for. And strive as we will, we cannot return to the old certitude. Our modern habits of critical reflexion have simply destroyed the immediate faith and axiomatic certainty of former days. Many of the 'fundamental truths' of Christianity are strict matters of history; and criticism has made it more and more impossible to accept without question any authoritative historical tradition.

Now we may debate the question whether these grounds of opposition are justified, and how far they touch the substantial truth of religion; but it is surely too late in the day to decry this growing movement of opposition as a mere upheaval of Satanic powers. Rather it should be clear to us that new spiritual forces are here at work, which make a justifiable demand; and that if Christianity is to retain or to regain its power some radical reconstruction will be necessary. In the meantime it must be evident that the religious standpoint has been increasingly set aside.

2. The second type of mind is that represented in the standpoint of immanent idealism. In some forms idealism stands aloof from Christianity, in others it stands incorporated with it, and in others again it is unconsciously substituted for it. It has this, at least, in common with the religious type of mind, that the central reality and the central interest of life are found not in the sense-world, but in an invisible spiritual thought-world. But with the idealist the element of negation, which is so prominent and essential a factor in religion, is toned down or set aside. The spiritual and the natural are scarcely separated; they are but two sides of the same truth—the one the inner reality, the other the outer manifestation. For the idealist God is not the world-superior of Hebrew and Christian faith, but the world-pervading force, the spiritual unity of the whole; and the aim of life is to reach below the surface of the world to the unseen spiritual reality which it veils and yet manifests. The true good of life is not the merely useful, is not to be measured by the surface or material value; it is essentially a spiritual good, in which the particular and individual will is subordinated to the universal will or universal self which is one with the deeper law of the universe.

This type of life may be traced back to the Platonic philosophy, and has close analogy with certain aspects of Christianity; but it has reached its full development in modern times, among the cultured adherents of the idealistic philosophy.

Now doubtless much has been achieved from this standpoint. It has made possible large and comprehensive and genial views of life, and without deprecating the spiritual it has yielded—what the modern mind insists on—a due appreciation of the natural side of life, a strong affirmation of life's present values. Yet this idealism, like the religious type of mind, has recently suffered an eclipse; the only question is why it has given place to what are apparently less elevated altitudes. The reason is that this modern idealism, with its joyous affirmation of life and its optimistic view of the rationality of the universe, can appeal only to the cultured and favoured few. In a great formative period of activity, and among those who were engaged in creating new worlds of thought, the

idealist contentment with the universe as it stands was not impossible. But men of ordinary cast of mind, who stand close to the hard facts of life, are not likely to be satisfied with any easy optimism offered in the name of philosophy. *Is* nature, then, really a manifestation of spirit? Is it not often quite obviously indifferent to the spiritual ends? Does not actual life teem with facts that stubbornly resist all idealizing processes?

For many to-day idealism is only a sort of half-way house between the older religious standpoint and the frankly irreligious view of the present age with its interest in immediate existence. What indeed, is the Immanuel God of idealism but a vague abstraction; what but the ghost of the older personal God of religious worship? If we abandon the reality, why retain faith in the shadow?

3. From these older conceptions and modes of life the modern mind is turning away dissatisfied; and instead of old mythologies and vague idealisms is finding a centre of interest in life's realities—either in nature, or in social life, or in the satisfaction of his individual personality. The first of these modern types is seen in the naturalist or materialist scheme of life, where the point of departure is nature, with its mechanism of laws, in the knowledge and use of which man's happiness is conceived to depend. Human life is conceived as a simple development of nature; and its spiritual elements are a mere by-product of the material. Science is purely a matter of experience, reflecting the order of sensible impressions. God, Freedom, Immortality belong to the realm of old-fashioned dreams, scarcely pardonable in the clear light of modern science. Man's ideal is simply to acquire and use what is of material value, to know and conform himself to his environment; for only so is happiness attainable.

This naturalistic temper of mind has passed far beyond the limits of the scientific world; it represents the practical attitude of great masses of men to-day, who have turned dissatisfied from the illusions of religion and philosophy to the immediate material realities. There is in this temper of mind an honesty of criticism, and an aspiration after reality, which claim to be respected.

Yet men will not find permanent satisfaction in this substitute for the older ideals. Indeed, were the underlying conception, which reduces the spiritual to the natural, consistently carried out, it would lead not merely to the destruction of the moral and religious life, but to the destruction of science itself. It is obvious to all that if man is merely a part of nature, subject entirely to nature's law, fighting for existence like all other animals, then the higher moral life, the realities of love, self-sacrificing friendship, devotion to ends beyond ourselves, must be radically reinterpreted, or dismissed entirely as illusions. But it is also true that from this standpoint, logically adhered to, science itself is an illusion. For if reality lies only in the passing impressions of our sensible nature, the claim of science to discover permanently valid truth must be wholly illusory. The last word of naturalism must be Humism, the denial of the possibility of knowledge.

Science itself implies more than nature. It is no mere copying of sensible impressions; it is at least a combining, a unifying of experience, and that involves a mind that is something more than a 'bundle of sensations.' Not only religion, then, with its kingdom of God: not only morality with its high activities of honesty, love, sacrifice, and devotion to work: not only art with its striving to pass through the thing of sense to the ideal beyond it; but science itself with its organizing of natural fact—all alike prove that man in some sense stands apart from nature and is higher than nature. All these human activities in the invisible world of spirit will render for ever futile any attempt to reduce the spiritual to the natural, to make truth and beauty and goodness mere by-products or outgrowths of nature.

4. Another type of the modern mind is seen in the socialist attitude, where the social relationship is taken as the ground-fact of human life. The individual is explained by social facts, such as heredity, education, environment, so that guilt or responsibility, instead of being individual matters, are laid rather at the door of society. Hence tolerant judgment passed on individual wrong-doing; hence, too, the remarkable extension of the sentiment of solidarity. The all-pervading ideal here is the happiness of the greatest number, consisting in the proper distribution of the utilities that serve mankind; and prevailing evils and inequalities are conceived as finding their only possible remedy in some reorganization of society. Eucken cordially admits that there often works in this temper of mind a large-hearted utilitarianism,

which labours to soften the severities of justice, to protect the weak against the lawless strong, and to throw open the door of opportunity to all. Yet the exclusive utilitarian position cannot but tend to lower the moral ideal to considerations of physical preservation and material good.

Certain it is that the exaggerated emphasis on the social aspect of life fails to do justice to the independence of the individual, and to the value of the individual ideals even as measured by the social standard. Is it true that society and the social motives are the real roots of progress? Has not all notable advance in any sphere—moral, social, scientific, religious—been due to the labour of individuals who rose above the social conditions and at times defied society? Or could science accomplish what it has done, were it only motived by what is useful for society? Could the socialist himself work so disinterestedly for the common good, unless he recognized unconsciously the worth of a life of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice—things that cannot be measured by any utilitarian standard?

5. In fact, we have another type of life to-day, which emphasizes the independent value of the individual with as much insistence as the other does the importance of society. This type is that of the individualist—Eucken gives Nietzsche as a prominent example—whose main thought is to be free from all conventions, to develop himself by the unhampered expansion of his life in all directions, and to taste the sweetness of life in all its range of possibility. From this standpoint the life of sense and the life of spirit are equally valuable, and the individualist seeks to taste the pleasures of both, unhampered by old-fashioned scruples or social rules. While this type also has its measure of truth, it gives little promise for the future. Apart from the obvious charge of egoism, it may be questioned whether the individualist ever really attains what he seeks. Freedom and power are noble ideals. But is freedom found by obeying one's own changing moods and by flouting conventions. Is not the man who pursues such a path rather the slave of the moment, a reed shaken in the wind? And is power really found by the man who narrows his interest within himself, and so becomes incapable of genuine devotion to work, or of sacrifice and self-forgetting love—which are assuredly the greatest sources of power in the world?

The Spiritual Life.

Now all these types of life are prominently represented to-day, and, with whatever variations, they serve comprehensively to describe the present situation. The older ideals are decaying, and one-sided naturalism, one-sided socialism, or an Epicurean individualism is occupying the ground. The present-day culture has turned away from the infinite ideal to the worship of 'realities,' *i.e.* to the realities of the immediate present. Everywhere the trend of life is from the invisible to the visible, from the spiritual to the natural, from vague eternal futurities to the immediate and certain present. And, no doubt, under this banner of realistic culture progress has been made—progress in science and invention, in technical and historical knowledge, in social organization—all leading to a life that is superficially larger; but the deeper things of the spirit remain in the background. We are outwardly rich, and inwardly poor: rich at the circumference of life, empty and poor at the centre. We sometimes hide our poverty by a hesitating return to this or that tradition that was born of high spiritual ideals. Thus 'we proclaim in our religion the confessions and feelings of bygone times as our own convictions: we build our domes in styles that express a different spiritual environment; we depend in our philosophy on systems and problems of other times; in all we are lacking in the truth of life.' In short, we have been gaining the world and losing our soul. And the crisis of the situation will appear all the more acute if we consider that the social unrest, the strong and passionate desire of the masses to share to the full in the world's happiness, comes at a time when the old foundations are being swept away, and the aim of life is directed to the present and merely human to the neglect of the deeper spiritual values. An idealism no longer certain of itself, fighting against a positivism that cannot satisfy; an individualism idolizing self-power and unrestrained license; a vast social movement that sees only material good,—if mankind pursue this path, what can we expect but the destruction of the spiritual life?

This crisis constitutes a challenge to those who represent the nobler guiding forces of society; a challenge not to be met by a timid return to old tradition or by inventing some new and extravagant scheme, but by a real and positive reconstruction

in which the substantial truth of the old will be conserved, and the truth in which the modern mind insists is also fully assimilated. A new and broader theory of the universe? No; but something more substantial in the first place. What is needed, and what is actually beginning to show itself beneath all the soulless culture of to-day, is a new movement of the spiritual life towards the discovery and appreciation of itself on the deepest reality. This deeper life-movement, which the philosopher can only interpret and bring to clear consciousness, may be seen even in the varied movements we have described, shallow and soulless as they appear. It is seen in the materialist's devotion to his science, which is in direct contradiction to his materialism, for it shows that in his claim to survey and eliminate nature, he himself stands spiritually above nature. It is seen in the socialist's devotion and self-sacrifice, which directly contradict the end of material happiness he professes, and show that for him the spiritual good is higher than the material. It is seen even in the individualist's demand of freedom and his claim to be allowed to make the best of his life—though he has not yet discovered where true freedom and self-development lie. In short, wherever you find unselfish devotion, genuine sympathy, self-forgetting love, even interest in work for the work's sake, there you find a reality that is above nature with its individual strivings. The spiritual life has thus some foothold still; indeed, it can never die, or be permanently ignored. As yet, however, this deeper world of the spirit has not been understood at its true value. We think of it as an ideal that is as a shadowy realm, and quite secondary to the reality of nature. What we need then, in order to press forward with a clear consciousness of our aims and to unite the forces of modern life in substantial progress, is a new metaphysic, or, shall we say, a new appreciation of the spiritual life in us, as the deepest reality in our experience. As against the realism of to-day, which places the centre of truth in material things, we have to rise to a new realism of the spiritual life, as a movement not growing out of the merely natural, but striking its roots deeper into the whole of reality. The only satisfactory key to all our experience is that there is an independent spiritual life, not a product of the individual man with his natural likes and dislikes, but communicating itself to him, and exalting him above nature and revealing itself on the deeper reality of the universe.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS.

ROMANS XV. 4.

'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.'—R.V.

ST. PAUL here states a great principle. It is the principle that the Old Testament was throughout designed for the instruction and establishment of New Testament believers. That is to say, the true 'Author behind the authors' of that mysterious Book watched, guided, effected its construction, from end to end, with the purpose full in His view of instructing for all time the developed Church of Christ. We have here a principle to guide us in the study of the Scriptures, both of the Old and of the New Testament. Their main use lies in their power so to teach as to develop character in us. 'Whatsoever things were written aforetime,' that is to say, the whole of the Jewish Scriptures, including the Histories, the Psalms, the Prophecies (however they may have originated, and by whatsoever channel they may have come down to us), have now this definite purpose to fulfil, this practical end to serve, that they contribute to our learning. They exist for the information of the present, and for the education of future ages.

I have purposely refrained from reading *Lux Mundi*, but I am quite sure that our Christian faith ought not to be perilled on any predetermined view of what the history and character of the documents contained in the O.T. must be. What we are bound to hold is that the O.T., substantially as we receive it, is the Divine record of the discipline of Israel. This it remains, whatever criticism may determine or leave undetermined as to constituent parts. No one now,

I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history—I could never understand how any one reading them with open eyes could think they did—yet they disclose to us a gospel. So it is probably elsewhere. Are we not going through a trial in regard to the use of popular language on literary subjects like that through which we went, not without sad losses, in regard to the use of popular language on physical subjects? If you feel now that it was, to speak humanly, necessary that the Lord should speak of the 'sun rising,' it was no less necessary that He should use the names 'Moses' and 'David' as His contemporaries used them. There was no critical question at issue. (Poetry is, I think, a thousand times more true than History; this is a private parenthesis for myself alone.)[1]

I.

What We are to Learn in the Scriptures.

There are many kinds of learning to be got out of the Bible. It is a great manual of Eastern antiquities; it gives us information about the ancient world which we can obtain nowhere else. It carries us back to the early dawn of history, when as yet all we commonly mean by civilization did not exist. Again, it is a handbook of political experience. It shows us what a nation can do, and may have to suffer; how it may be affected by the conduct of its rulers; how it may make its rulers to be like itself. So again, it is a rich collection of the wisdom which should govern personal conduct; a man need not believe in Revelation in order to admire the shrewdness and penetration of the Book of Proverbs. Again, it is a mine of poetry; it contains the very highest poetry which the human race possesses; poetry before which the great masters of song—Homer, Dante, Shakespeare—must bow; poetry by which the two last have been, in fact, themselves largely inspired. Once more, it is a choice field for the study of language; in its pages we follow one language, the Hebrew, from its cradle to its grave; and it gives us lessons in the art of making language describe the emotions and moods of the soul which are not to be found elsewhere. But a man may be a good antiquarian, historian, economist, linguist, moralist; he may take the keenest interest in Scripture because it has so much to say on each and all of these subjects; and yet he may be entirely ignorant of the true teaching of Scripture. He may read the Bible, just as some people come to Church, only to admire the architecture or the music, thus missing the very end which these beautiful and useful accessories of worship are intended to promote—the communion of the soul with God. Language, history, poetry, antiquities—these are not the subjects which the Bible was intended to teach us, interesting and valuable as they are in their way; they are taught in other books, ancient and modern, and by human teachers. The Bible must do something more for us than this, if it is to claim its title of the Book of God.

[1] Westcott, *Life and Letters*, ii. 68.

The Bible contains every type of true and valuable religious literature that is to be found in non-Christian sacred books, from the products of high psychic excitation to those of devout reflexion and ratiocination: prose and poetry, vision and chronicle, mystic flights and apophthegms of shrewd practical wisdom, religious out-pourings and ethical precepts. What we admire in the Vedas, in the Zend-Avesta, in the works of Lao-tsze, Confucius, and Mencius, in the sublime precepts of Gautama-Buddha, in the splendid zeal of Mohammed—all is there, and far more besides. There is a theology latent in the Bible that will never become obsolete; there is a human life depicted there which will supply inexhaustible ideals for men of every race and generation; there is a regenerating power in the sacramental truths enunciated there that none of the other 'Bibles' can point to. By the side of the revelations embodied in the Christian Scriptures the sacred books of China show themselves not religion at all, but mere philosophy; Buddhism is but negative; Islam, with its remote, despotic God, is void of all message of redeeming love.[1]

> We search the world for truth; we cull
> The good, the pure, the beautiful
> From graven stone and written scroll,
> From all old flower-fields of the soul;
> And, weary seekers of the best,
> We come back laden from our quest,
> To find that all the sages said
> Is in the Book our mothers read,
> And all our treasure of old thought
> In His harmonious fulness wrought,
> Who gathers in one sheaf complete
> The scattered blades of God's sown wheat,
> The common growth that maketh good
> His all-embracing Fatherhood.[2]

The text lays down very clearly the belief in the abiding value of the Old Testament which underlies St. Paul's use of it. The Scriptures are to be read for our moral instruction, 'for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness'; for the perfection of the Christian character, 'that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.' St. Paul claims for the Old Testament these two things: (1) it teaches us great moral and spiritual truths; and (2) it witnesses to Christ.

[1] L. Ragg, *The Book of Books*, 281. [2] Whittier.

1. *The whole Old Testament was written to teach us great moral and spiritual truths*, and therefore it has an abiding practical value for faith and life. It is refreshing to recall St. Paul's claim when we have been harried by the worries of criticism, with the wrangles over Old Testament records. After all, let the dates and the authors be what and who they may, let the process by which the materials came together be long or short, simple or complicated, discoverable or undiscoverable, there at last the record stands, there at last the Book lies open before us, and the clear purpose which has brought it together is as manifest and certain as ever. It is the record of the spiritual experiences of a race, experiences unique and prolonged, and manifold and momentous, experiences which embody and disclose the ways by which God has worked in the world, the methods by which He has drawn men near to Him, the discipline under which He has trained and purged and uplifted them. Through varied periods, under infinite variety of circumstance, still He pursued His design with them, till they came to a clearer understanding of that mind. Over two thousand years of historical development carried on the continuous tale, and now, collected, sifted, amalgamated, there the entire story lies. Unknown hands, it is true, have worked at it, unremembered lives have uttered themselves through it, but all witness to the will, the character, the intention with which God Almighty deals with men's souls and bodies; and since He is the Eternal God who changeth not, it reveals for all time and to all people what is His perpetual mode of treatment, His rule of conduct, His moral characteristics, His Fatherly handling, His way of bringing out judgment into victory. Therefore all these things are significant for us to-day, they reveal how that eternal God will prove Himself to be the same to us as to men of old time who served and trusted Him then.

2. *The Old Testament witnesses to Christ.* It is not only a bead-roll of faith, not only a record of heroic testimony, a treasure of splendid experience, but it is also a unity, a single Book, a single, supreme, consistent, continuous action. From end to end it says one thing and one only; it recalls one single event. By St. Paul's own special title it is called the mystery, the open secret, the Divine act of revelation, the thing that God was always doing under cover as hidden leaven, yet preparing to be disclosed—the thing that was prepared from the foundation of the world, and that was at last done at the one fit moment, at the time and at the spot made ready according to the end decreed—the Mystery, Jesus Christ, the Hope of Glory. From cover to cover the Book is full of Him, and of Him only, one mind felt in it everywhere, one spirit quickening it, one Face looking out. From cover to cover the Bible records but one fact; it is a body possessed by a single dominant soul, and the soul that possesses it is Jesus Christ. He is the Harmony into which all its voices blend. He throws this or that into the background. He brings other parts forward to the front; His character is the Bible's conscience. His life is the measure of its inspiration.

Grant me, Lord, in all my studies,
Through all volumes roaming where I list,
Whatsoever spacious distance
Rise in ample grandeur through thought's mist,
Whatsoever land I find me,
That of right divine to claim for Christ.

Do men dare to call Thy Scripture—
Mystic forest, unillumined nook?
If it be so, O my spirit!
Then let Christ arise on thee, and look
With the long lane of His sunlight
Shall be cut the forest of His Book.

II.

How We are to Learn.

'Through patience and through comfort of the scriptures.'

No one can take account of the wide world darkened for the most part by gross idolatry, so that a fraction only of mankind even now know the name of the one God: no one can look out upon Christendom, desolated by war, and degraded by sin: no one can ponder the differences by which the foremost champions of right and purity and love are separated, without being at first filled with doubt and dismay. Can this, we ask, be the issue of the gospel, this partial spread, this imperfect acceptance, this discordant interpretation of the truth? When we are thus cast down, the Scriptures bring us comfort. By the long annals of the Divine history of mankind—so long that we can hardly go back in imagination to the earliest forms of religious life which they record—we are taught to see the slowness

of God's working, the patience with which He accepts what man in his weakness can offer, the variety of service which He guides to one end; and hope is again kindled.

Nature illustrates the lesson of the Bible. No result has been established more certainly by recent investigations than the gradual passage from lower to higher types of life in the natural world through enormous intervals of time. So far from this being opposed to revelation, as some have rashly argued, it falls in exactly with what the Bible teaches us of the spiritual progress of men. Why there should be this marvellous slowness in either case we cannot tell. It is enough for us to know that in this respect the whole Divine plan goes forward to our eyes in the same way. And if cycles of being came into existence and perished, if continents were washed away and re-formed before the earth was made fit for the habitation of man, we shall not wonder that it was by little and little that he was himself enabled to apprehend his relation to God, and through God to his fellows and to the world. And following the same guidance we shall be contented to wait while this knowledge which has been given to us spreads on all sides from scattered centres of light. Such has been the law from the first. We who see but little, and that little for a short time, would perhaps gladly have had it otherwise; but as we trust the Bible we can hope with full assurance, looking with patience to that end towards which all creation is moving, however slowly.[1]

E. von Dobschütz, writing on the 'Bible in the Church,' calls it 'the unparalleled religious guide-book.' He further asserts that 'an unusually favourable opportunity is afforded in the letters of Bismarck to his wife, from which we learn that the Bible was read daily by one of the greatest statesmen. . . . The chief enemy of the Bible is ignorance of it. Doubts and suspicions do not arise from Bible-reading, but they are communicated from outside to those who are not acquainted with the Bible. Of the whole book these people know only those passages which are attacked by the modern "Enlightenment." Consequently they hold it in contempt . . . as a hindrance to education and culture. Had they ever experienced any of the comfort and gladness which the pious reader can draw from its pages, they would be of a different opinion. The history of the Bible is an objective proof of its beneficent operation.'[2]

Charles Dickens, in a letter to his youngest son, when the boy was leaving home to join his brother in Australia, wrote: 'I put a New Testament among your books, for the very same reasons, and with the same hopes, that made me write an easy account of it for you when you were a little child. Because it is the best book that ever was . . . known in the world; and because it teaches you the best lessons by which any human creature who tries to be truthful and faithful to duty can possibly be guided. As your brothers have gone away, one by one, I have written to them such words as I am now writing to you, and have entreated them all to guide themselves by the Book.'

[1] Bishop Westcott.

[2] *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. ii., pp. 592, 607, 615.

1. *Through patience of the scriptures.*—This 'patience' is holy perseverance under trial, the patience which suffers and is strong, suffers and goes forward. Rich indeed are Pentateuch, and Prophets, and Hagiographa, both in commands to persevere and be of good courage, and in examples of men who were made brave and patient by the power of God in them, as they took Him at His word. And all this, says the Apostle, was on purpose, on God's purpose, that we also may learn to take Him at His word, to trust His plan concerning us.

When Robert Grosseteste was asked whence he had acquired his gentle, tactful, and courtly manners, the peasant's son, who had developed into the greatest man of his generation, is reported to have answered: 'It is true that I come of a humble father and mother, but from my earliest years I have studied the best men in the Scriptures, and have tried to conform my actions to theirs.'

2. *Through comfort of the scriptures.*—The word here used means more than 'consolation' though it includes consolation; it might be translated 'encouragement'; it means the voice of positive and enlivening appeal. The spirit of comfort is not so much that of a nurse as of an elder and braver comrade. The word in English is a strong word akin to fortitude, and the Greek original has a heartening, encouraging tone about it—the tone of a voice that calls to us like that of a friend, cheers us on, animates and invigorates us, as when the angel in Daniel's vision bids him not to fear, but to be strong. We call the Holy Spirit our Comforter; and although that is not an accurate rendering of the original word, which really means One who can be called to our side as a supporter, it does fairly represent, if we read it aright, the strengthening office of that Divine Friend beside us, whose presence at once commands and enables us to be strong and of a good courage. Comfort involves the renewal of energy, the recovery of lost or impaired force; it sets us on our feet again, it sends us back to our work with a fresh impulse: the very reason for which we are 'spoken to comfortably' is that we may rise up and go forth to meet the Lord, when He comes to us in all the might and love of the Ruler and the Shepherd.

Fancy a man thrown in upon himself, with no permitted music, nor relaxation, nor literature, nor secular conversation—nothing but his Bible, his own soul, and God's silence! What hearts of iron this system must have made. How different from our stuffed-arm-chair religion and a 'gospel

of comfort'! as if to be made comfortable were the great end of religion.[1]

Charlotte Brontë, in a letter to Miss Ellen Nussey, written on February 20, 1837, confessed: 'Last Sunday I took up my Bible in a gloomy frame of mind; I began to read; a feeling stole over me such as I have not known for many long years—a sweet, placid sensation like those that I remember used to visit me when I was a little child. . . . I thought of my own Ellen—I wished she had been near me that I might have told her how happy I was, how bright and glorious the pages of God's holy word seemed to me.'[2]

III.

The Reward of Learning.

'That we might have hope.'

This is the promised reward of all our learning, 'the hope set before us.' The 'hope' spoken of here is the Christian hope, the hope of the glory of God; and the Christian has it as he is able, through the help of God's word in the Scriptures, to maintain a brave and cheerful spirit amid all the sufferings and reproaches of life. For hope has been worthily called 'the energy and effort of faith'; a 'real act of the will' and moral nature; a refusal 'to be cowed and depressed by evil'; unlike the mere buoyant exuberance of spirits which belongs to a sanguine disposition, too light-hearted to feel difficulties or understand perils,—it is such a gathering up of all the interior forces in deliberate reliance on God as can elevate, fortify, and inspire. We need it now, in days when some who pass for philosophers, but have given up the true 'wisdom,' preach a view of life which is hopeless and which, as it has been well said, can be met and overmatched only by the repression of atheism, whether professed or virtual. The question of hope for man is ultimately the question of a God for man, and indeed of man himself, as a moral and spiritual being.

1. *We find hope for ourselves*, in our present lives and in our final destiny. A man must have hope for himself first, if he is to have hope for others. If he wishes to have hope for the world, he must first have hope for himself, for he is in the world a part of it, and he must learn what blessings God intends for him, and they will teach him what blessings God has in store for the earth. Faith and hope, like charity, must begin at home. By learning the corruption of our own hearts we learn the corruption of human nature. By learning what is the only medicine which can cure our own sick hearts, we learn what is the only medicine which can cure human nature. We learn by our own experience, that God is all-forgiving love; that His peace shines bright upon the soul which casts itself utterly on Jesus Christ the Lord for pardon, strength, and safety; that God's Spirit is ready and able to raise us out of all our sin, and sottishness, and weakness, and wilfulness, and selfishness, and renew us into quite new men, different characters from what we used to be; and so, by having hope for ourselves, we learn step by step and year by year to have hope for our friends, for our neighbours, and for the whole world.

Her languid pulses thrill with sudden hope,
That will not be forgot nor cast aside,
And life in statelier vistas seems to ope,
Illimitably lofty, long, and wide.
What doth she know? She is subdued and mild,
Quiet and docile 'as a weanèd child.'

If grief came in such unimagined wise,
How may joy dawn? In what undreamed-of hour
May the light break with splendour of surprise,
Disclosing all the mercy and the power?—
A baseless hope, yet vivid, keen, and bright,
As the wild lightning in the starless night.

She knows not whence it came, nor where it passed,
But it revealed, in one brief flash of flame,
A heaven so high, a world so rich and vast,
That, full of meek contrition and mute shame,
In patient silence hopefully withdrawn,
She bows her head, and bides the certain dawn.[3]

2. *We gain hope for the world.* It is a deadly thing when the Christian allows himself to lose hope, when he allows himself to think that all is lost. Position after position seems to be taken. People say: 'Look at the educated world, they have forsaken you; they have taken your title-deeds, and found them to be faulty; they have examined your dogmatic utterances and found them to be incredible; they have taken the results on which you rely and have found other causes to account for them, with which religion has nothing to do. The educated world is against you, you are fighting for a lost cause if you hope to see the triumph of Christianity.' 'Your churches even are gone,' says the apostle of despair, 'you mourn in your sad penitential appeals for those who will not

[1] F. W. Robertson, *Life and Letters*, 211.

[2] Clement K. Shorter, *Charlotte Brontë and her Circle*, p. 213.

[3] Emma Lazarus.

lament for sins in which they do not believe. You pipe in your solemn feasts to those who will not dance, and leave you clad in the robes of an æstheticism which has failed to attract, or decked with popular appeals which have failed to charm. Your very schools are gone,' continues our pitiless opponent; 'children are growing up who will revolt against the fetters which have kept their fathers in bondage too long.'

Yet, in spite of it all, Hope is still able to raise her voice, and also to make it heard, as it brings forward the encouragement, if it be but as a piece of floating seaweed, which tells us that the enterprise will yet be crowned with success. When the smoke of conflict rolls away, and there is a lull in the noise of battle, we see that we are not only in a position which is not hopeless, but in the midst of the orderly working of a well-recognized plan. If society has its sinners, society also has its saints. Those who know the inner life of the Church know its vigour and its triumphs; those who know her children know that Christ still takes them up in His arms and blesses them. If any one is tempted to despair let him follow the advice of St. Paul, let him consider the days of old and the years that are past, let him drink in patience and comfort from the Scriptures, for they will show him not only examples of those who waited for the Lord, and found His never-failing aid; but more than this, a plan which has never wavered, not even when all seemed to be lost, a plan which reached its crisis when those who waited for the consolation of Israel seemed to be only a handful of worn-out watchers. No purpose of God has failed, nothing once endued by Him with life will fail of some purpose in His Kingdom, stern though that purpose may become.

Both Testaments declare
(As here evinced) how blissful is their state,
Ordained of God friendship with Him to share.
Isaiah says that in their native land
Each with a twofold vesture shall be dight;
And by his words, this life I understand.
The same more clearly hath thy Brother shown,
When, speaking of the garments pure and white,
This revelation he to us makes known.[1]

3. *Our hope is fulfilled in Christ.* The hope of the gospel is a hope of God in our Saviour Jesus Christ. It rests upon God's eternal counsel, which He has been working out ever since the world began, and which we can spell out piece by piece in the records of His book. The coming judge is none other than the Saviour; neither will His judgment be any new thing. He is judging every one of us at every moment; severing the good from the bad in us, and burning our chaff with fire unquenchable. We shall be more entirely filled with that Divine hope the more we strive to bring the thought of our Saviour and Judge to bear upon all our present doings. And if sorrow or want or any other trial presses us down now, and seems to make hope almost an impossibility, let us remember that it is through the patience and the comfort of the Scriptures that we are led on to Hope.

I have found something in the sky and sea
Like to a mystic message partly heard,
That speaks to me when all my soul is stirred
By some far hope that lays its hands on me.
When for a wider scope my heart makes plea,
And frets at life like an imprisoned bird,
There comes from star and wave a soothing word—
The healing touch of earth's immensity.
As to our childhood's eyes all heaven lay
Just where the sea flowed through the Western gate.
So for our life-dimmed sight some larger fate
Gleams through the vista of the dying day:
It is God's word to us that soon or late,
Where the heart leads the feet shall find a way.[2]

[1] Dante, *Paradiso*, xxv. 88–96 (tr. by Wright).
[2] Percy C. Ainsworth, *Poems and Sonnets*, 67.

Harnack on 1 Corinthians xiii.

By Principal the Rev. J. G. Tasker, D.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham.

The report of the proceedings (vol. vii., 1911) of the Royal Academy of Science (Prussia) contains an erudite paper[1] by Dr. Adolf Harnack on 'St. Paul's Hymn in Praise of Love.' It is a fresh and suggestive study of 1 Co 13, with special reference to its significance for the student of the history of religions. Its value is greatly increased by numerous elaborate and luminous notes. With the addition of these notes, the original essay has become a pamphlet of 32 quarto pages.[2]

The theme of the hymn is found in 1 Co $8^{1f.}$: 'Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth. . . . If any man loveth God, the same is known of him.' After digressions on other subjects, the Apostle returns to this theme as he is discoursing on spiritual gifts. Alike in its subject-matter and in its style, the hymn differs from the chapters between which it is found. To discover the connexion of thought, it is necessary to ascertain the meaning of 12^{31}: 'But desire earnestly the greater gifts. And a still more excellent way shew I unto you.' What are we to understand by 'the greater gifts'? And how can the contents of the hymn be described as 'a way'?

By 'the greater gifts' Harnack understands the virtues which in Gal 5^{22} St. Paul calls 'the fruit of the Spirit.' It is true that, in the narrower sense of the word, they are not 'gifts' (*χαρίσματα*); but of set purpose the Apostle writes paradoxically. Properly speaking, the 'gifts' mentioned in 12^{4-11} are extraordinary (*Zugaben*), and the Corinthians are reminded that the greater gifts are those virtues which are essential elements in the Christian character. Harnack is aware that the majority of expositors understand by 'the greater gifts' those which are more profitable for edifying; but he is confident that the comparison is with all the gifts enumerated not only in $12^{29f.}$, but also in $12^{4ff.}$: 'It is quite arbitrary to make any limitation here.'

Harnack agrees with Godet and Meyer in preferring *κρείττονα*, 'better,' to *μείζονα*, 'greater.' It is probable, he thinks, that *κρείττονα* was the original reading in 12^{31}, but that the text of this verse was assimilated to 13^{13} and 14^{5}, where *μείζονα* is rightly used in comparing gifts which belong to the same category. *μείζονα* is 'an almost exclusively Alexandrine reading.'

When in v.^{31b} St. Paul says, 'And besides a super-excellent way shew I unto you,' Harnack holds that 'way' must be interpreted quite literally, and not metaphorically, as, *e.g.*, 'doctrine.' The way in which St. Paul would have the Corinthians run zealously is 'love.' The negative and positive virtues enumerated in 13^{4-7} are 'the better gifts,' and 'because love is their root, love is the means, as it is also the way, to their attainment.' In the Apostle's estimation, love is at once the best of the better gifts, and the way which leads to all the rest.

The 'Hymn' is divided into three parts, consisting respectively of vv.$^{1-3.\ 4-7.\ 8-13}$. A detailed commentary is not attempted, but difficulties of interpretation are discussed at length. Occasionally, however, a welcome flashlight illumines a familiar passage, as when attention is called to the rhetorical effect of the repetition of the emphatic word 'all' in v.^{2}, and to the contrast between what a man *has* and what he *is* in the climax of the same verse. 'It could not read, "I *have* nothing," for such a man has the most extraordinary gifts; but in the midst of these riches of knowledge *he is himself nothing*, that is to say, he is even poorer than poor.'

The longest investigation (seven pages) in the essay is devoted to an attempt to determine the true reading in v.^{3b}. Did St. Paul write 'if I give my body *to be burned*' (*καυθήσομαι*), or 'if I give my body *that I may glory*' (*καυχήσωμαι*)? On grounds of textual criticism alone, Harnack thinks that the question cannot be decisively answered. Indeed, the balance would incline towards *καυθήσομαι*, were it not that Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and Clement of Rome may be quoted in favour of *καυχήσωμαι*. The scales are even, so far as external evidence is concerned. It remains to consider the internal evidence.

[1] *Das hohe Lied des Apostels Paulus von der Liebe (1 Kor. 13) und seine religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung.* Von Adolf Harnack. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Sonderabdruck. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

[2] This paper, it should be said, is not printed in the two substantial volumes of Essays by Dr. Harnack, recently published under the title *Aus Wissenschaft und Leben*.

In favour of καυθήσομαι, commentators have urged that the supposition of a voluntary fiery death is especially appropriate when it is desired to cite an extreme example of self-sacrifice (cf. Dn 3^{28}); that the reading is too difficult to have its origin in an emendation of the text; that, on the other hand, the change to καυχήσωμαι is easily explicable, inasmuch as St. Paul frequently used the word; and that this reading is unsuitable to the context, and destroys the sense of the verse. In reply, Harnack says that the difficult reading is καυθήσομαι, as is proved by the varieties of interpretation: martyrdom by fire is not the sacrificing of self for others; many suggestions are improbable, as, *e.g.*, fiery torture endured rather than make a confession to the disadvantage of others, or the branding of slaves; expositions which regard the phrase as having no special application fail to account for its presence; moreover, this general sense is more forcefully given without what ought to be the emphatic word: 'and if I give my body.' (For the absolute use of παραδιδόναι, cf. Ro 4^{25}, and Plut. *Demet.* 49 f.) If Dn 3^{28} is quoted, it must be remembered that a passage so well known might account for καυθήσομαι as a copyist's error, and certainly this change was more likely to be made than the reverse alteration after the era of martyrdom had begun. The awkwardness of the expression is hidden in the English translation, but it deserves consideration: 'The Greek language has no need to use such a circumlocution as "if I give my body so that *I may be burned.*"'

It remains to meet the objection that the reading καυχήσωμαι destroys the sense of the verse. Harnack confesses that this would be the case if 'glorying' meant 'empty boasting,' but the word has a far nobler significance. He complains that sufficient attention has not been paid to St. Paul's frequent assertion that the Christian may have a 'glorying' (καύχημα), which is the exact opposite of 'vainglory' (κενοδοξία). A word which is used fifty-five times by St. Paul must be interpreted 'psychologically,' that is to say, his use of it will reflect the characteristics of his mind. If he can write, 'We glory in our tribulations' (Ro 5^{2}), why can he not say, 'We glory in giving our body'? The Apostle knew that there is a glorying which is 'not good' (1 Co 5^{6}), but he also desired ground for glorying in the day of Christ (Ph 2^{16}). There is a glorying which is seemly to the Christian, and it may furnish a worthy motive for self-sacrificing deeds. But even the self-sacrifice contemplated will be counted 'nothing' without love. Love is essential to any glorying in the day of God.

If καυχᾶσθαι is the original reading, the change is accounted for by the fact that writers like Ignatius and Hermas do not use the word in a good sense. [Clement of Rome is an exception (*Ep. Cor.* xxxiv. 5), but Pauline influence is traceable in his Epistle (cf. 2 Co 7^{4}.)] As signifying 'boasting,' it would be a stumbling-block; the change, involving only a single letter, is the more easily explicable, because some of the early Fathers understood 'if I give my body' to refer to martyrdom, whereas St. Paul has in view such cases as are mentioned by Clement of Rome (*Ep. Cor.* lv.): 'Many kings and rulers . . . have delivered themselves over to death, that they might rescue their fellow-citizens through their own blood.' Finally, to prove that the thought involved in his exposition is apostolic, Harnack pertinently quotes 1 Jn 4^{17}: 'Herein is love made perfect with us, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment' (2 Co 7^{4} shows that 'boldness' and 'glorying' are parallel ideas).

In v_{1}^{7} Harnack prefers 'covereth' to 'beareth' as the rendering (cf. RVm) of στέγει. The translation 'beareth' (R.V.) too closely approximates to the meaning of ὑπομένει (R.V. 'endureth') in the same verse. Clement of Rome quotes 1 P 4^{8}, 'love *covereth* (καλύπτει) a multitude of sins' (*Ep. Cor.* xlix.) before sentences taken from this chapter. The climax of part two (vv.$^{4-7}$) is found in the words, 'love rejoiceth in the truth,' for Harnack holds that in συγχαίρει (R.V. 'rejoiceth with') the σύν is strengthening, the compound form of the verb being used for the sake of the rhythm. In support of this rendering he quotes 1 Co 5^{8}, Ro 2^{8}, 2 Th 2^{12}, Clem. Rom. *Ep. Cor.* xxxv. 5, Clem. Alex. (*Quis dives*, xxxviii.).

Much of the charm of Harnack's exposition lies in the aptness of his illustrative quotations. In Nu 12^{8}, 'With him (Moses) I will speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, not in dark speeches,' he finds the clue to the interpretation of St. Paul's words: 'Now we see in a mirror, in a riddle; but then face to face' (v.^{12}). Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. 19, 94) regards the 'mirror' as referring to the knowledge of God derived from self-knowledge and from knowledge of our brethren. But Harnack sees no reason for such limitation. 'Certainly Paul is thinking also of the mirroring (*Spiegelung*)

of God in nature and in history.' Attention is also called to the different use of the figure in the newly discovered *Odes of Solomon* (13): 'Behold, the Lord is our mirror: open the eyes and see them in Him: and learn the manner of your face.' Dr. Rendel Harris also notes that in the Ode 'the thought is not as high as in Corinthians, where holiness is found by the Vision of God rather than by the scrutiny of ourselves.'

Passing, in the latter half of his paper, to the contents of the chapter as a whole, Harnack comments suggestively on its style. In form it is the most sublime of all St. Paul's writings. 'Poetry, in the strict sense of the word, the Hymn is not, but it is oratory (*Rede*); therefore to describe it as a hymn is not quite correct.' Its rhythm and its poetic form, as well as its literary grace, are due to its inspiring thought and its intense emotion. The Hymn consists of three parts and a closing verse: the necessity of love (vv.[1-3]); the nature and effects of love (vv.[4-7]); the perpetuity of love (vv.[8-12]). The æsthetic attractiveness of the Hymn is ascribed to the exquisite choice of words, the combined strength and simplicity of the style, and the effective use of antithesis and repetition. With the exception of the first verse, no use is made of 'descriptive and picturesque adjectives.' The emphasis is invariably on the verb, so that, paradoxical as it may sound, the Hymn is as remarkable for its animation and movement as for its statuesque grace ('*so erhält der Lobgesang die lebhafteste innere Bewegung neben einer lapidaren Monumentalität*').

The stylistic differences of the three parts are admirably brought out: as, *e.g.*, the parallel construction of vv.[1-3], the ascensive use in each verse of the clause 'but have not love,' and the climactic effect of the brevity of the close of vv.[2, 3]—two words in the Greek—'I am nothing' and 'I am profited nothing.' Harnack's retention of the 'I,' which is the subject throughout this part, brings out what its dominance signifies, the incontrovertibility of the Apostle's assertions. In part two the solemn threefold use of 'love' in v.[4]—(note the chiasmus)—introduces three of its main attributes, but in the following verses the heart of the Apostle is too full to allow of the repeated utterance of the word; eight negative sentences introduced by οὐ are followed by four positive statements introduced by πάντα. 'The style becomes increasingly impetuous, the words appear to tumble over each other; but it is merely in appearance—each word stands firmly in its place. The ecstasy is an ecstasy ἐν νοΐ.' In part three the tone changes. Three chiselled words (*lapidaren Worten*)—'love never faileth'—introduce the closing theme. But immediately the writer's inward emotion is reflected in the twofold interchange of plural and singular (plural in vv.[9, 12a], singular in vv.[11, 12b]). The 'I' is typical, not individual, but the change is impressive. Note is also taken of the rhetorical effect of the five times repeated νήπιος in v.[11], of the contrasts (ἄρτι and τότε) and antithesis in v.[12], also of the correspondence of the three tenses in v.[12] to the preceding antithesis. In the closing verse, by 'a genial diversion,' the word 'abideth' is used instead of 'never faileth,' and the climax is reached in the statement of which 'love' is the final and emphatic word: 'the greatest of these is love.'

For the student of the history of religions the interest of the chapter lies, according to Harnack, not in discussions raised by some modern scholars concerning 'tongues of angels' and a clanging cymbal,' but in discovering the relation to Greek thought of St. Paul's teaching in regard to love and knowledge. In some respects it is manifest that Paul, so far from being the disciple of Plato, differs essentially from Greek philosophers. 'They blend knowledge and love (*amor intellectualis*). Paul separates them; they recognize, indeed, a gradually increasing knowledge, but qualitatively all knowledge is identical, Paul denies this; according to them our present knowledge, notwithstanding its imperfection, is the best thing in the world, Paul is far removed from this faith.' In these and in some other respects 'Paul is a Jew, and desires to know nothing of the wisdom of the Greeks.'

But St. Paul's depreciatory estimate of knowledge refers to present conditions, or to knowledge 'in part.' Of perfect knowledge his judgment is very different. In this particular it may still be asked: Does not his teaching resemble Plato's? According to the Apostle, 'the best thing in the world, the best thing in this temporal state, is love; but the absolute best, for which his soul longs, is perfect knowledge, knowledge "face to face," knowledge in which "I shall know, even as also I have been known."' To this knowledge the Apostle's thought turns in this chapter as he hymns the praise of love, and in another passage

in this Epistle (8^3) he takes a step in advance and says: 'If any man loveth God, the same is known of him.'

The result of Harnack's inquiry is that he finds in 1 Co 13, confirmation of his view that only those Christian ideas and institutions survived and became Catholic which have a twofold origin. 'Catholic Christianity is the product of two converging lines which ultimately meet; of these two lines one begins with the prophets and may be traced through the later Psalms to its development in late Judaism, including early Christianity; the other line is discernible in the development of the Greek philosophy of religion, inclusive of the mysteries.' Not only do the two main lines converge and finally meet in the third and fourth centuries, but from them side lines diverge and meet each other.

St. Paul's high estimate of perfect knowledge is, in Harnack's opinion, accounted for by his Jewish education; even his conviction that the highest knowledge is the knowledge of God was not, in the first instance, derived from Platonism. A minute study of Nu 12^8 is held to show, not only that it underlies v.[12], but that it explains the phrase which seems at first Platonic, namely, 'in a mirror.' The Pauline phrase δι' ἐσόπτρου corresponds to the LXX ἐν εἴδει (Heb. מַרְאֶה). 'This word explains at once the βλέπομεν and the δι' ἐσόπτρου of Paul; for מַרְאֶה means not only "seeing" and "what is seen," but also "appearance" as distinguished from "essence," and finally "mirror" (Ex 38^8).' The figure of speech is accounted for by St. Paul's knowledge of the word as it occurs in the passage which was before his mind. He 'longed to see God, as once Moses was promised that he should see God; there is no necessity to have recourse to Plato.' It cannot, however, be denied that a Greek philosopher might have used this figure of speech, and it may be questioned whether St. Paul could have given such sublimity, by means of so slight a change, to the familiar saying, had he not breathed the Hellenic air. 'Two converging lines in world-history meet here.'

The sentence 'then shall I know even as also I have been known' would have been understood by Plato, but it would not have conveyed to his mind St. Paul's teaching. The Apostle's meaning is clear from 8^3: 'If any man loveth God, the same is known of him.' With the implication that truth and unrighteousness are incompatible, Plato was, however, in complete agreement.

Harnack's contention that throughout this chapter St. Paul is thinking of the love of one's neighbour does not carry conviction, and he himself acknowledges that 'for Paul love, even as love of our neighbour, is inseparable from the love of God.' In the Apostolic age he finds evidence of the *converging*, but not of the *meeting*, of two lines of development of thought: 'the humanitarian-Stoic, and the theistic-Jewish.' It is granted, however, that 'in Hellenism (as, *e.g.*, in Epictetus) a strong religious element blended with the humanitarian conception.' Yet, strange to say, the thought of St. Paul is said to move only on the humanitarian line; apparently Harnack intends this assertion to be understood in the light of another statement which seems to justify a wider interpretation of 'love' in this chapter: 'in and with love to our neighbour, the love of God, religion itself, is included.' If the love of God and the love of our neighbour are conceptions so nearly akin, if indeed they form 'such a unity as to be interchangeable,' there seems to be no valid reason for confining St. Paul's statements concerning 'love' within humanitarian lines, more especially as Harnack lays special stress on the theistic-Jewish element in the Apostle's teaching.

In his closing paragraph Harnack reaffirms his conviction that 'as Paul was not a Greek, so he never became a Greek.' Yet Bishop Hicks has said: 'I never read 1 Co 13 without thinking of the virtues in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. St. Paul's ethical teaching has quite a Hellenic ring. It is philosophical, as resting on a definite principle, namely, our new life in Christ; and it is logical, as classifying virtues and duties according to some intelligible principle' (*Studia Biblica*, ix. 9). Harnack would allow 'the Hellenic ring,' though probably he would not regard St. Paul's ethics as 'philosophical.' He is not surprised that some of the Apostle's ideas have been found growing in Greek soil; but he maintains that 'the Apostle would not have adopted them, unless they had fitted in with knowledge which he already possessed during his religious training as a Jew.' His experience, as a Christian, enabled him to transform this knowledge, but 'the Apostle of the Gentiles remained a Jew, in so far as he was not a Christian. . . . That his thoughts were influential subsequent

to the Hellenic age is due, in the first instance, not to the slight Greek element found in them, but to the power which enabled the Apostle anew to proclaim the ancient God of the Jews as the Father of Jesus Christ, and to place love at the centre.'

This fascinating and brilliant study suggests a further question: May not St. Paul's knowledge of the Christ in whom there is 'neither Jew nor Greek' explain the meeting in his teaching of the two converging lines? Even so far as this eulogy of love is concerned, there is great force in the words of the Rev. Bernard Lucas: 'It was the life of love which Jesus lived which made the Psalm of love which Paul wrote possible. We have but to substitute Jesus for love, the person for the thing personified, and Paul's panegyric becomes a simple and perfect description of the historic Jesus. As a literal portrayal of the character of Jesus it cannot be surpassed. . . . Is it any wonder, therefore, that as a manifestation of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, Paul should assign the supreme place to love?' (*The Fifth Gospel*, p. 153).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Skill.

By the Rev. James Hendry, M.A., Forres.

'There is not among us any who can skill to hew timber like unto the Sidonians.'—1 K 5^6.

It is our wisdom to recognize that other people can do some things better than ourselves. It is our wisdom either to learn of them, or by fair business to avail ourselves of their skill. Some would say that in the building of the Temple, only Israelite material and Israelite workmanship should be used, even if inferior to what heathen Hiram could give. Solomon's wisdom said, 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein.' It is the cedars of God that grow on Lebanon. The heathen craftsmen have their skill from God. And so, the timber and the skill of the Sidonians were used, and at the dedication of the Temple Solomon made one prayer specially for strangers who might worship there, and a millennium later the Lord Jesus in purging the House declared that His Father's House was meant to be a House of prayer for all nations.

Instead of the Temple, built for the Name of the Lord for a time, we have now the Holy Scriptures, declaring the Word of the Lord for all time. Let us consider to whose skill it is due that we have a printed Bible, in which every one of us can commune with the Lord over all His Word to us. Could you skill to make that which is least—the ink with which your Bible is printed? Before you could have your Bible, God had to have his gall-flies at work in His oak-forests, and His poor people gathering the oak-galls, and passing them on to His chemists who can now skill to produce that unfading ink with which Bibles are printed. Could you skill to manufacture the paper? Left to ourselves most of us would have to fall back on more primitive writing materials—bricks of clay, or tablets of wood, or skins and hides, or bulrushes sliced and pasted together, and we are debtors to all who through long centuries kept up their writing and preserved the Scriptures on these clumsy materials. For paper itself we are indebted to heathen Turkestan, and to the Arabs who there discovered it and the way to make it. But almost till the invention of printing six centuries later, Christian Europe scarce thought such a heathen and Muhammadan article worth minding. But now the rag-collector sorts out every scrap of linen to be used for a Bible or some book of value. Could you skill to put the rags through all the process needful to make the fine, firm, faultless paper of your Bible? You are indebted to those who can skill to do so, and you are indebted to the rag-gatherer. No rag-gathering, no Bible for you such as you have, to fit you for every good work, and in your good work you should forget neither the humble people nor the skilful people who have worked together to fashion the page on which the heavenly treasure is set forth to you.

Now we have to get that greatest thing, the Word of God, to put on the paper. That Word did not come forth from us. None of us could skill to produce it. It is God's Word—written by

Him in the whole experience of Israel, and in an unceasing succession of living epistles, and some of these were qualified by His Spirit to record what God wrote into the life of Israel and into their own souls. And then He wrote His perfect Word in the Life that was manifested in the Lord Jesus, and qualified some to record and interpret that writing. For the Word which now is published to the ends of the earth, we are debtors under God to all the long and manifold experience of Israel, and to the height and depth of the experience of Christ. But the original record of the Word is useless to us, unless some one interpret. So another class of workers is needed, a succession of scholars laboriously perfecting themselves in the skill to keep the dead Hebrew and Greek speaking the living language of each new generation. Some Bible-readers disdain to own any indebtedness either to scholars or to rag-collectors. God's wisdom uses them both.

Now could you skill to do the printing? Yet, first, could you skill to make a printing machine, one that could produce your Bible at the price you paid for it? Why, you must go further back, and take account of multitudes of men learning through the centuries how to skill in mining, how to skill in smelting the mineral ores, how to skill the first rude invention, and then the perfecting of the printing press. And it is all made to work together for you, that each of you may have in your hands the Scriptures which are able to make you wise to salvation.

Enlarge your thoughts. You must take account of all shipbuilding skill, and of all the seamen, for some of the indispensable material comes from abroad, and the Word itself came from abroad. You must add the skill of all the distributing agencies, all railway skill, the skill of all carriers and merchants. These workers of all the ages had to be fed, and clad, and housed, and so you must take in all those skilled in the production and preparation of every kind of food and clothing, and all who can skill to quarry stone and hew timber, all the building trades, all the furnishing trades, all the women who care for the home,—aye, and as human hearts are merry and are sad, you must include those who can skill in music. And as it was with Solomon's workers, there must be all kinds of officers from kings downwards, legislators, judges, armies and navies, captains of industry, doctors lawyers, bankers, all of every degree who help to keep things going decently and in order. They have all made a contribution to the work that had to be done ere you could get the Bible you have got. Reduce the skill of any set of any of these endless workers, and you will add to the cost of your Bible; increase the skill of any of them, and you will get a cheaper or a better book. You wonder at the vast number of Solomon's workers, but what are they to the countless millions who through the ages have contributed to the skill required to furnish that Bible to you. In the Chronicles we are told that Solomon's army of burden-bearers and quarrymen were slaves, of the old Canaanites of the land, and you shudder at the thought of the Temple of God being built by such labour. Yet of old, and until to-day, among the millions working together for the furnishing of your own Bible, the great mass of them have been enslaved, oppressed, sweated, and for the most part unaware, until they went beyond this life, that God had a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. You never would have had your Bible, had not even the Lord of Glory humbled Himself to burden and agony and death. Your Bible is marked with blood of His, that cannot be hid. Aye, and for the preservation of the Bible to you, He required multitudes of His martyrs to give up their lives rather than give up their written portions of His Word. Neither can you enter for yourself into the benefit of your Bible, without finding yourself moved to cross-bearing of your own in doing justly and loving mercy and seeking to work deliverance on the earth. Do you skill to read your Bible so as to have that mind in you? Why, here is another class of workers—those who taught us to read,—and some of us would never have been taught, had not Cæsar, forty years ago, made a decree that, in spite of the objections of many, all the children should be schooled. And so, by the skill to read —so little and yet so great a skill—the work of all the other workers is made available, and all the treasures of the heavenly wisdom are at the disposal of whosoever will read.

Blessed is he who reads and considers, for he will get the witness in himself that God is speaking to him, and speaking His chiefest Word, Jesus Christ, into him, in order that he himself may become a Temple of God. And in that Temple your worshipping heart will hear the Father's voice reminding you, that you are set in the midst of

other children of His, all of them precious to Him as you are,—and you are very precious. Yet Christ died for the others also, and you are in their midst not to condemn yourselves to uselessness by withdrawing into a shell of your own away from them, as if without them you could be perfected. You are in their midst to remember that He who is your Head has been Head over them all to make them all contribute some measure of service and skill towards your having the Word of God in the form you do have it, and therefore you are in their midst like your Saviour to serve, and to be one of His living epistles to them. If you consider how God has made you dependent on, and indebted to, all this endless skill and labour of all men, even for God's own Word in your hands, surely your heart will muse and meditate, till it burn within you, and make you to speak and to purpose before God like Paul, when he said, 'I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise'; and therefore, as much as lieth in me, I must be ready to use my own measure of skill in the service of the gospel, for in some matter or towards some person, it will doubtless be the case that even I can skill to hew timber better than any one else.

The Attitude of the Outspread Hands ('Orante') in Early Christian Literature and Art.

By Dr. D. Plooij, Tiel, Holland.

II.

Baptism in ancient Christianity had a far more than symbolic meaning. It was a mystic *reality*, a guarantee and seal of new birth. In the centre of all baptismal ideas and beliefs in the ancient Church stands the word of Christ: *ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν*; and the word of Paul (Ro 6[7]): *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται τῆς ἁμαρτίας*: Christianity is new life, but new life is possible only through death. One must die first, that new life can begin. Now this death may be a real one, as in martyrdom for the sake of Christ; then it is as is said in *Didasc. Syr.*: 'Wenn wir nun zum Martyrium um seines Namens willen berufen werden, und mit dem Bekenntniss aus der Welt gehen, so werden wir rein sein von allen Sünden und Vergehungen und als unschuldig erfunden werden.'[1] Or to put it with the words of *Const. Aeg.* xiv. 3: 'Si enim fit ut ei (namely, a catechumen who is *not* yet baptized) vis inferatur et interficiatur ad peccata sua redimenda justificabitur; *baptismum enim in proprio sanguine accepit.*'[2]

But it may be also a mystical death as symbolized and wrought in baptism, not less real, only its reality is of another kind. The parallelism of baptism and death must be derived from a word of Christ Himself; cf. Mk 10[38]: *δύνασθε . . . τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι*;[3] I do not believe that the sons of Zebedee understood the meaning of these words when they answered, 'We can.' There is no trace that this parallelism was in use before Christ. Nearly all other baptismal ideas and customs we can follow in their origins into Judaism, or further into early Semitic religion, but as far as I know baptism as a symbol of death, especially of martyrdom, does not occur before our era, and in the quoted words of Christ we may see the evidence that it was He who first drew the parallel,[4] probably seeing in His

[1] Ed. Achelis, Leipzig, 1904, T.u.U., N.F. x. 2, S. 102.

[2] Funk, *Didasc. et Const. Ap.* vol. ii., Paderborn, 1906.

[3] Cf. Lk 12[50].

[4] The only Semitic pre-Christian sphere of ideas which might be congenial to the *later* development of this parallelism is that of the dragon lurking in the waters, no doubt a very old Semitic monstrum related to the great Tiamât, which must be conquered. In Egypt we might find some parallel in the rites, *e.g.*, of Abydos, where 'le dieu Thot sortait en bateau pour repêcher le corps d'Osiris. Ailleurs c'était Isis qui voguait à sa recherche' (Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme Romain*, p. 278, Paris, 1907). Perhaps an echo of such speculations may be heard in the word of Zeno Veronensis, lib. ii. tract. 39, ad neophytos: 'Cum omnium aquarum natura sit talis ut cum in profundum homines suscipiat vivos, evomat mortuos, aqua nostra suscipit mortuos et evomit vivos.' It is for this reason, I believe, that the story of Jonah is so frequently painted in early Christian art of the Catacombs.

own baptism in the Jordan a prophecy of His own passion and death according to the interpretation of passages as Ps 42^8, Ps 69^2; Ps $124^{4.5}$. At all events, the sons of Zebedee did not understand the allegorical meaning of Jesus' words, as may be inferred from their dreams of power and honour even at the moment Jesus spoke to them on passion and death.

But a few years afterwards, when Paul writes to the members of the Roman Church, it is self-evident to him that his readers understand him when he writes: 'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his *death*? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death' (Ro $6^{4f.}$); cf. Col 2^{12}. So in baptism the mystical, *i.e. real*, union with Christ and His death is symbolized, to be baptized is to participate in His death and to be buried in the grave from which through the power of Christ we too will rise with Him into new life. This idea remains unchanged in the early history of baptism, or rather it grows more massive, when regeneration as it is wrought in baptism grows more and more magic and mechanic, and so it is dominant in all baptismal controversies even in the later history of the Church. To Paul, however, regeneration was a spiritual experience of life of which baptism was the symbol. To him surely a symbol means more than to our modern thought: there is a mystic and mysterious connexion between the symbol and the experience signified by it, but the spiritual is fundamental. To the following generations the symbol *per se* was the magic medium through which death and birth are brought about. To quote only one witness: Cyprian, in his Ep. 71 c. 1 (ed. Hartel, p. 722), argues that baptism can never be administered by a heretic, for 'it is clear that those who are not in the Church of Christ are dead, and so it is impossible that another person can be made living by him who does not live himself.'

But it is not only the parallelism of baptism and death, but also that of baptism and passion, *i.e.* crucifixion, which is speculated upon, first by Paul and after him in all baptismal literature and liturgy. In Ro 6^6, having spoken of baptism, Paul proceeds, saying, 'that our old man is crucified with him'; and in Gal 2^{20}, he says, 'I am crucified with Christ.' Undoubtedly Paul meant with these words something more than we are inclined to understand from them. I am not sure of it, but I believe there is a strong evidence that he was conscious of such symbolic stretching out of the hands in the form of the cross which we have been discussing. We need not think of dead liturgy when we suppose that Paul alludes to such confessional act and union with Christ practised by the catechumens in his time, no more than we have to do so when finding such various symbolical acts alluded to in the Odes of Solomon. The living faith, the desire to express faith in visible acts, which in those times and circles, especially in Eastern regions, was far stronger than in our abstract century and for our Western character, could not but produce such confessional symbols, which in their mystic significance for the second and third generation became almost sacramental.

Thus not only the symbolic meaning of the outstretched hands, but also the combination of it with baptism, and so the baptismal use of it, are explained. There remains, however, one point to be discussed: the attitude of the so-called 'orante' in Christian art. For we find it not only, as we have seen, in liturgical literature, but far more frequently and impressively in ancient Christian art, which—it may be said directly—for the most part, at least in the earliest times, had a sepulchral character. For the interpretations of the early Christian sepulchral symbols, Wilpert in his standard work has given some perfectly sound and strict principles, of which I quote as especially important: 'Als obersten Grundsatz, als erste Pflicht hat der Interpret beständig im Auge zu halten dass er Bilder welche Grabstätten schmücken, erklären soll. Die Funeralsymbolik ist ganz *von der Heilsidee* beherrscht und durchdrungen.'[1] As far as I know, the full consequence of this principle has not yet been drawn out. Le Blant and, after him, Wilpert have acknowledged the value of ancient *funeral* liturgies, but the importance of the baptismal liturgies is far greater. In later times the *day of death* is the beginning of new life, as may be seen from every calendar; but in early Christianity, not the day of death, but *the day of baptism* was the birthday of new life,[2] and

[1] *Malereien*, Tekstband, S. 140.

[2] The connexion between both lies, of course, in the idea of baptism of blood and baptism of water. For martyrs the day of death was the birthday of new life; for all other believers it was the day of baptism.

to have received baptism was to be sure of heavenly happiness and salvation, yea, to have received it already. Augustinus says: 'Aqua velut morientem deducit in tumulum; spiritus sanctus velut resurgentem perducit ad caelum,'[1] and to mention a witness from heretic circles in earlier times: Hippolytus says of the Naässenes: ἡ γὰρ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ λουτροῦ οὐκ ἄλλη τίς ἐστι κατ' αὐτοὺς ἢ τὸ εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν ἀμάραντον ἡδονὴν τὸν λουόμενον κατ' αὐτοὺς ζῶντι ὕδατι καὶ χριόμενον ἀλάλῳ χρίσματι.'[2] Such passages, which may be found at every turn in early Christian literature, show that baptism for the early Christians was not only a symbol of their death with Christ, but also a guarantee of their life with Him, and this not only in the future but already in this present life: 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead' (Col 2^{12}). Baptism *is* birth, with baptism the new life begins, the unbaptized is dead. I will give only a few examples more which may stand for many others. Justin, *Apol.* i. 6_1, says: 'After that they (the catechumens) are brought by us unto a place where is water, and there they are born again in the same way as we have been born again . . καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν? Here ἀναγέννησις is used entirely as a *synonym* for βάπτισμος. In baptismal literature we find regularly used: 'birth' simply in the sense of *new* birth, and, *e.g.*, in an epitaph printed by De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea*, i. tav. 17, 2, we read: *Maxema qu(a)e vixit in pace anvos(=annos) triginta, i.e.* Maxima has lived thirty years after being baptized. In '*The Precepts of* [*En-katzi and*] *Wardan about Baptism*,' translated by Conybeare in his *Rituale Armenorum*, p. 107, we find: 'And that the priest plunges the child three times successively into the water conveys the mystery of the three days' burial of Christ as if the child was buried with Christ. And his bringing up out of the water is as if he ascended with Christ from the dead *into heaven. For the bema is a model of heaven.*' Perhaps the strongest example of the synonymic use of baptism and birth, is that in an Epiphany canticle (Conybeare, *Rit. Arm.* p. 178) where it is said: 'Blessed Saviour Emanuel, born of the Virgin—by way of rebirth wast thou baptized to-day in the Jordan.'

[1] 'Liber testimoniorum fidei contra Donatistas,' c. viii. (in Pitra, *Anal. Sacra*, p. 150^b).

[2] *Refut.* v. 7 (p. 100), 86, ed. Duncker et Schneidewin.

Finally, I quote an epitaph found on the *Via Latina* in the middle of the nineteenth century and printed, *i.e.*, by Dölger,[3] of which I reprint the verses:

κάτθανε καὶ ζώει καὶ ὁρᾷ φάος ἄφθιτον ὄντως.
ζώει μὲν ζωοῖσι θάνεν δὲ θανοῦσιν ἀληθῶς.

All this will be justification enough of my thesis, when I say that to understand and to explain the early Christian sepulchral symbols and paintings we have, in the first place, to consult not only the funeral liturgies, but also the baptismal literature. The more because there are several paintings and among them the very oldest, which *omnium consensu* have a baptismal meaning.

In explaining the figure of the 'orante,' one of the most frequent figures in the catacombs and on the sarcophagi, hitherto it has been neglected that the attitude as a prayer-act is not peculiar to Christianity. It is the name 'orante' which as a doom lies on the interpretation of the figure. For not only the Christians, but in the same way and much earlier the heathens, prayed in this attitude. Christians have taken it over, and that they retained it was in consequence of the cross which they saw symbolized in it. Then, already for this reason, the important meaning of the 'orante' cannot be the *prayer*, which might be expressed by it, but the symbolism of the cross which early Christians saw involved in it. The sepulchral symbols have a *hidden* meaning: only those who have been initiated in the Christian mysteries know the significance of the fish, the anchor, the dove, Noah in the ark, etc. A pagan eye could see only the outward history. Then in the 'orante' not the prayer is the hidden meaning, but the cross of the outstretched hands.

Wilpert[4] thinks that the 'orante' expresses the intercession of the deceased, for the surviving, and refers for this opinion to some inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries, which testify such intercession. But Dr. Oberman[5] argues that so often figures of saints painted in company of 'orantes' are not represented in a praying attitude, and that there are other epitaphs which ask the prayer of the surviving for the deceased.

[3] ΙΧΘΥΣ, *Das Fischsymbol in Früh-christlicher Zeit*, Bd. i. S. 169, Rom, 1910.

[4] *Malereien*, Tekstband, S. 457.

[5] *De Oud-Christelijke Sarkophagen*, 's Gravenhage, 1911, p. 37.

Von Sybel[1] and Oberman[2] explain the praying attitude as denoting not intercession, but adoration. It is in the presence of God that the 'orante' is represented, so his prayer is prayer of adoration. But why, then, are Noah in the ark, the three youths in the furnace, Susanna—to mention only the older representatives of the 'orante' figure—represented as 'orante'? There, at least, adoration in the presence of God seems entirely out of place.

All difficulties, however, seem to fall away when not prayer but confession of Christ is the first meaning of the stretching out of the hands. After our inquiry this meaning of the 'orante' may be esteemed to be beyond question, and it may be asked if this is not the right meaning also in early Christian art. In some paintings the meaning of prayer may remain unshaken, but, *e.g.*, merely by seeing in the attitude of the 'orante' a symbol of baptismal confession it becomes clear why Noah in the ark (a baptismal symbol too!) is painted as 'orante.' And the same observation may be made in other paintings, *e.g.* the three youths in the furnace are a symbol of baptism,[3] and therefore painted as 'orantes.' Ephrem (*Hymn.* ed. Lamy, i. 77) says: 'The three illustrious men in Babel were baptized in the furnace of fire, and emerged from it. They were entered and had bathed in the womb of the flame . . . heavenly dew moistened them there . . . the real fire that blazed signifies the fire and the Holy Ghost who is mixed and hidden in the water. By the flame he typifies baptism.' And Zeno Veronensis (lib. ii. tract. 71) gives the same interpretation of the men in the furnace: 'They were not wanting the grace of baptism in the furnace filled with cooling dew.' To this may be added, that for the interpretation of the dove with the branch of olive to be found on one of the paintings of the three men in the furnace (reproduced by Wilpert, *loc. cit.* Taf. 78, see Tekstband, S. 358[3]), and which is rather astonishing in its surrounding, we may listen to the 'Orationes S. Basilii Magni episcopi' given in Syriac text and Latin translation by Assemanus, *Cod. liturg.* iii. p. 199 ff. There we read (p. 224): 'Tu modo etiam Domine Deus, mitte super aquas istas (baptismi) per sanctum hoc verae unctionis oleum columbam tuam illam, quae est supra omnia saecula,' etc., and p. 225: 'In ramo olivae mysterium olei annunciavit columba Justo (Noe).' We cannot pursue this further here, but all this points to a direction which hitherto has been neglected, and which may yet give light to many an ancient Christian symbol hitherto not sufficiently explained.

So when we see the three men painted in the attitude of 'orante,' it is not the attitude of adoration, but the baptismal confession which is alluded to. Only continued study in this direction can make this all clear in its connexions. I will only give two examples which confirm the given interpretation. De Rossi, *Roma Sotterr.* tom. ii. tav. xl. nr 8, 11, gives reproductions of two 'orantes,' which show the stigmata Christi in their hands. If these reproductions are correct, and there is no reason to doubt it, these paintings confirm the interpretation of the 'orante' as a symbol of the cross and the confession of Christ, and illustrate a passage to which Dr. Dölger, Würzburg, in a communication of 5th September 1911, draws my attention, in Clem. Alex. *Exc. ex Theodoto*, c. 86, §§ 1–3 (ed. Stählin, iii. 135), where it is said of the baptized that he bears the stigmata Christi in himself.

And second: Wilpert gives (Taf. 207) a beautiful reproduction of an acrosol-painting in Cimeterium maius, representing, according to him: 'Madonna betend und mit dem Jesus knaben.' I can leave undiscussed the question if Wilpert is right in seeing Madonna in the woman and Jesus in the child. I will only draw attention to the two monograms of Christ painted at each side of the woman: they have the same design as the attitude of the 'orante,' namely, to express a confession of Christ, and so the two symbols explain each other mutually.

I repeat that the 'orante' sometimes can express prayer; of course, for it was attitude of prayer too. And I do not say that only a living person when being baptized, could be represented so: the painted symbol is only a reminder of baptism as a guarantee and beginning of new life, and this new life is continued in heaven where believers praise God and confess Christ as on earth. What I mean to say is only that the peculiar meaning of the 'orante' is the cross and the baptismal confession of Christ.

Thus also early Christian art is a witness to the old baptismal rite we found in the Odes of Solomon and in baptismal rituals. It survived

[1] *Chr. Antike*, i. S. 262.

[2] *Loc. cit.* p. 47.

[3] A combination of *baptismus sanguinis* and *baptismus fluminis!*

only in forgotten corners of Christianity, and even there it will be now quite extinct, I suppose. In Christian art it became traditional even when the confessional meaning was forgotten, for the custom of praying in this attitude remained. It is for this reason that for *later* times the explanation as prayer—*adoratio* or even *intercessio*—may be the right one.

Literature.

EUCKEN.

All the books that Professor Rudolf Eucken has written (and most of them have been translated into English) are to be passed by for the present until we have read and reread and altogether mastered *Life's Basis and Life's Ideal.* For this book, which has been well translated by Mr. Alban G. Widgery, and has been published by Messrs. A. & C. Black (7s. 6d. net), is not only the latest but also the clearest statement of his philosophical position that Professor Eucken has yet given us.

We say it is well translated. Mr. Widgery has had special advantages. He knows Eucken; he knows him intimately and appreciates him. And to know Eucken intimately and appreciate him is to know his philosophy. His philosophy is the outcome of his attitude to life. To know the man is to understand, better than from all his written works, what he means when he speaks of the development of personality and spiritual individuality.

This book is, we have also said, the latest of Professor Eucken's books. That also is a great consideration. For Professor Eucken's mind is active. Has he a philosophical system? You may call it a system if you please. But it is not a system that is finished and at a standstill. While he lives he thinks, and as long as he lives you will never be sure that you have his last and best word. Therefore read the latest book always. Coming from Professor Eucken it is likely to be the best.

This, at least, is the best hitherto. It is not the clearest. Or at any rate it is not the easiest. It demands study, patient and determined. But it yields the most satisfactory results. It brings out the far-reaching issues that are involved in this philosophy of life, and it lifts the author himself to a mental and moral height which he had not attained before. In popular opinion Eucken and Bergson are struggling for the mastery. Probably Bergson will win; but Eucken, though he may never become so popular, is likely to live longer.

The Rev. H. W. Morrow, M.A., of Trinity Church, Omagh, having preached a course of sermons on questions put by Christ, and another course on questions put to Christ, has published both courses in a volume entitled *Questions asked and answered by our Lord* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.). The idea is not original; but it is not an accidental idea. Each question has matter in it for many sermons, and the value of the questions is doubled by being considered together. So these sermons of Mr. Morrow's may be read with profit, even by those who have read the sermons of Mr. Bain and Mr. Knight. Their brevity is a surprise, so evangelical are they and even so theological.

The late Professor Adamson of Glasgow wrote the article on 'Logic' for the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica.* Before printing it the editor cut it down. Professor Adamson thought that it suffered in that process, and Professor Sorley of Cambridge, who has discovered the original manuscript, agrees with him. Professor Sorley has accordingly edited the manuscript and published it, together with other four articles, in a volume to which he has given the title *A Short History of Logic* (Blackwood; 5s. net). An encyclopædia article is expected to be intelligible to everybody. With the exception of an occasional phrase in Greek, Professor Adamson's article is intelligible. But the book has the appearance of being prepared for the student rather than for the general reader; and for the student no other convenient manual for the history of Logic is in existence.

Professor H. J. White, who worked so long

with the late Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury on the great critical edition of the Vulgate, has prepared a small edition of the Vulgate New Testament with a selected *apparatus criticus*, which has been published at the Clarendon Press in Oxford (2s. net; and on Oxford India paper, 3s. net). It is an edition which will at once supersede all other small editions. The title is in Latin—*Novum Testamentum Latine: Editio Minor.*

The editing of a magazine like the *Christian World Pulpit* may seem a simple affair. You have just to collect the sermons and fit them into the space. But ask the editor. Ask him what it costs to make the *Christian World Pulpit* representative of the pulpit of the Christian world. Ask him what it means to select the very best sermons, and especially what it means to reject the rest. The new volume (July to December 1911) is the eightieth. It contains sermons by no fewer than 138 preachers, among whom the most conspicuous are Mr. R. J. Campbell, Canon Hensley Henson, Mr. Stuart Holden, Dr. Horton, Dr. Newton Marshall, and the Bishop of Wakefield (Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.).

The latest volume of Messrs. Constable's 'Philosophies' will be the most popular. For its subject is *Bergson*, and its author is Mr. Joseph Solomon (1s. net). In size it is little more than a large magazine article. But as an introduction to Bergson no magazine article that we have seen comes within sight of this book.

To throw the imagination round a fact is not to make the fact less, although it may give it the outward appearance of fiction. Therefore the volume of tales and essays by Mahlon Cooper is called *Fact and Fiction* (Daniel; 5s. net). Did the author contribute these tales and essays to some magazine? If not, what an opportunity the magazines have missed.

Short and practical and very modern are the sermons which the Rev. Edwin P. Barrow, M.A., has gathered into a volume with the title of *The Way not a Sect* (Dent; 4s. 6d. net). The title is taken from the first sermon in the volume, of which the text is Ac 24^{14}: 'This I confess unto thee, that after the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers.' The sermon is an argument against the sectarian spirit. It may be necessary to form a new Way, as it was with Paul and Wesley, but it is not necessary to form a new sect, and it must never be done. 'It has been the aim of the truest reformers from the time of Paul to the time of Wesley, and from Wesley to Martineau, to prevent the revival of religion from becoming the formation of a sect.'

The Rev. Harry Drew, late Rector of Hawarden, once delivered a series of Advent Addresses on death and preparation for death. The addresses were so good and so characteristic that they have been republished in, and have given the title to, a volume of selected sermons which has been edited by Mr. G. C. Joyce, Warden of S. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden. The title of the volume is *Death and the Hereafter* (Frowde; 2s. 6d. net).

There is a movement on behalf of ethical education that is quite innocent of any desire to supplant religion. Its purpose is simply to enable the teacher to understand that the aim of education ought always to be the formation of character. Many manuals of instruction are in existence; but for thoroughness of treatment and rightness of tone we have seen nothing to be compared with *The Teacher's Practical Philosophy*, by George Trumbull Ladd, D.D., LL.D. (Funk & Wagnalls; 5s. net). Dr. Ladd deliberately prepared himself for writing the book by travel, not only throughout America, but also in Britain, Japan, Korea, and Hawaii, and by visiting seminaries and talking to teachers wherever he went. It is a considerable book to read through, and teachers have little time to spare; but it has been written and rewritten, so that now no time will be wasted in spelling out the meaning of it.

The unpardonable sin of the American pulpit is dulness, and very few of the American preachers are guilty of it. The risk they run is in the opposite direction. It is therefore a relief to find a preacher like the Rev. P. S. Henson, D.D., LL.D., who is not afraid to offer his people good solid exposition, with a leavening of anecdote but no sensationalism. The first four sermons in his book are on the four faces of Ezekiel's vision, and so the book is called *The Four Faces* (Philadelphia: Griffith & Rowland; $1 net).

Mr. Martin Haile and Mr. Edwin Bonney have together prepared and produced the *Life and Letters of John Lingard* (Herbert & Daniel; 12s. 6d. net). It was time for this to be done. Lingard died in 1851—sixty years ago. One of the gentlest of men, he lived in a perpetual torrent of controversy, and apparently it has hitherto been considered impossible to tell the story of his life with any frankness. But now the controversy is dead, and even most of the controversialists, and the story of Lingard's life has been told with both fulness and frankness.

The book is more than a biography. It is a history of the English Catholics for the first half of the last century. Lingard is sometimes forgotten for long spaces together. But all that belongs to the authors' purpose. Lingard was part, and no small part, of the times in which he lived. To know him intimately we must know these times well.

Lingard's name lives with his *History of England*. That History, fiercely attacked on its publication by his fellow Roman Catholics because it was too Protestant, and almost as fiercely by Protestant journalists because it was too Roman Catholic, is now admitted to be for its time almost a miracle of impartiality. Lingard's estimate of Thomas of Canterbury, for example—he admits having called him 'saint' once and almost regrets it—is now accepted by history. If Lingard had only cultivated a little grace of style (he says he had not time for it, so occupied was he with research), the History would have remained until this day.

But no one will be disappointed with the biography. It is well written and worth reading; and the publishers have enriched it with four beautiful photogravures and the facsimile of a letter.

'I had your short note, the shortest on record, yesterday. I think you are in low spirits, so I am writing this wee "sursum corda." You are probably working above your strength. Please remember that when we give what we have, the Lord makes it enough. He did not bid His disciples bake more loaves: would not even let them go to the villages for more. It is the blessing, not the amount of work, that tells. I always think the sower might have saved the seed that he wasted on the wayside and the shallow ground. He was in too big a hurry. I have always been a waster, so am now serving as a beacon to you, dear Highland maid. How fine and dear your father's salutation, "My wee seagull."'

This letter occurs in the life of *Lady Victoria Campbell*, which has been written by Lady Frances Balfour (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). It is an illustration of 'Don't do as I do, but do as I bid you do.' For Lady Victoria Campbell always worked above her strength. No cause that needed help, and even no person, was forgotten. At first you think of her as though she were the lady of the Song of Solomon, who cultivated every one's garden except her own. But you are arrested with amazement and shame. This woman was a saint.

Few are the men who would have dared to write a book with so comprehensive a title as *The Intellectual Development of Scotland* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). Mr. Hector Macpherson could dare and do it. He has himself had some hand in the development. He has been for many years in the heart of it, and he is both an observer and a writer. He is a writer, we say. You can do nothing with a subject of this kind unless you have a style to carry it off. In case there is nothing to remember afterwards there must be something to enjoy for the moment.

Need we say that no Scotsman will agree with him entirely? No Scotsman agrees with any other entirely on anything. The inevitable criticism is that Mr. Macpherson stands outside some of the movements, and stands outside deliberately. Why should a man, and a Scotsman, who knows what the Church has done for Scotland, write as if he were not a Churchman? No doubt Mr. Macpherson writes also as if he were not a man of science. But he does not of set purpose stand outside the scientific circle. Sometimes his distance seems to give him an advantage, as in the discussion on the dilemma of the modern Church about authority. But the advantage is lost the moment it is felt that the dilemma is exaggerated. What is the difficulty about authority? That the Bible has lost it? Not so. The Bible has educated a Christian conscience which returns to read the Bible and find it as authoritative as ever, though the authority is less external.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a new edition (1s. net) of *The Higher Criticism*, four papers written by Professor Driver and Dean Kirkpatrick. To be more accurate, they have published the three papers of the original edition, and added a fourth by Dr. Kirkpatrick. The new edition has also a new preface, which is signed by Dr. Driver, and which explains clearly, and surely once for all now, what the phrase 'Higher Criticism' means.

The power of the pulpit to-day is with the man who has a message and can deliver it in few words. The Rev. J. R. P. Sclater, M.A., minister of the New North Church in Edinburgh, draws young men to his church in great numbers every Sunday evening. For every Sunday evening he has a direct and distinct message for them, and he loses no time in delivering it. Fifty-two of these addresses have been published under the title of *The Enterprise of Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It would be wrong to say that they lose nothing by being read instead of being heard. But Mr. Sclater has a personality that cannot be killed even by the printed page. The reader has even, in one respect, an advantage over the hearer. He can read the addresses that bear upon the same topic at a sitting and thus feel the accumulating force of their argument more intensely than if he had to wait a week between them.

Messrs. Longmans have published a translation of Mgr. Batiffol's famous reply to Reinach's famous 'Orpheus.' Reinach's 'Orpheus' made a great impression in France, something very like a consternation. Its audacious assumption of superior knowledge, as if all the things that had ever been hidden from the wise and prudent were at last revealed unto this babe, frightened the French theologians almost out of their wits. So Batiffol delivered a series of lectures in answer to 'Orpheus,' and then published them under the title of '"Orpheus" et l'Evangile.' They have now been translated into English by the Rev. G. C. H. Pollen, S.J., and published under the title of *The Credibility of the Gospel* (4s. 6d. net).

Batiffol simply annihilates Reinach. Reinach's superior knowledge—that is to say, in the criticism of the Gospels—is superior and incredible ignorance. But Batiffol does more than that. He makes contributions to the study of Christian origins which are of independent and very considerable value. Thus the volume as it appears in this excellent English translation serves three good ends. It adds to our knowledge of early Christian literature, it provides a useful manual of Christian apologetic, and it repeats with emphasis the valuable advice which is so often forgotten, 'Ne sutor ultra crepidam.'

The Bishop of Down, Dr. D'Arcy, has contributed a volume to the 'Anglican Church Handbooks' on *Christian Ethics and Modern Thought* (Longmans; 1s. net). Into the book is condensed the matter that might have been given in a large octavo. Two things seem to Bishop D'Arcy to need most emphasis—first, that Christian Ethics come from within and therefore must be individual; next, that individual Ethics are nothing if they do not become social.

The President of Oberlin College has written many books, and has gathered confidence. Now he undertakes to survey the whole field of religious thought and experience. In a volume with the title, *The Moral and Religious Challenge of our Times* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net), Dr. King causes the whole world of ethical and religious life to pass before him, pronounces judgments, suggests remedies, and finds the one guiding principle which shall heal divisions and lift burdens. That principle is reverence for personality. By that principle he tests individuals and nations. As they attain to it they fulfil their being, as they fall short of it they fail. For the principle of reverence for personality is 'the key for man's discernment of himself, for the interpretation of history, and for the understanding of God in all His relations to men.' So we may say that the most modern rendering of the chief commandment is, 'Thou shalt reverence the Person of the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and thou shalt reverence the person of thy neighbour as thine own person.'

Dr. King did not make his book in order to fit this key. He had written his book before the key was found. And so we have the most interesting phenomenon of a book written under a quite unconscious spiritual influence, which is seen with trembling joy only when the book is finished.

Messrs. Macniven & Wallace have published

for the Church Worship Association, in connexion with the United Free Church of Scotland, a *Manual for Visitation of the Sick.* It is a charming book to handle, but yet more charming and precious within. It is the fruit of both prayer and pains, and a blessing will follow it.

Nearly thirty years ago—it was in the year 1884—Mr. F. E. Marsh published a book called *Emblems of the Holy Spirit.* He did not exhaust the emblems. He noticed only the emblems of Oil, Water, Dew, Wind, the Seal, the Earnest, and the Dove. And he let the book run out of print. He has now completed the emblems and published the whole in a handsome volume with the same title (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). Incredibly futile as much evangelical writing on the Holy Spirit has been, this is a book of substance and worth.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have also published a collection of lectures and addresses on the Jews from the writings of Dr. Adolph Saphir. The title is *Christ and Israel* (3s. 6d. net). And they have issued a small but notable volume of sermons by the Rev. A. B. Simpson, D.D., under the title of *The Christ Life* (1s. 6d. net).

The value of a volume of sermons is in its suggestiveness. A volume of sermons by the late Dr. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar, has been published with the title *Hours of Insight* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). Take the sermon on this text: 'The servants which drew the water knew' (Jn 2^9). It is an exposition of the whole text, indeed of the whole parable. But two things create new thought. There is a new exposition of the word 'kept,' and there is a wonderful application of the fact that the servants knew.

The Rev. J. R. Cohu is an amazingly prolific writer. We could not get past him for a season, if we would. But we welcome him. For his study is always conscientious and his own, whatever the subject may be. This time it is evolution. His book on evolution is worth reading, however much we have read on that subject already. His topic is not evolution and genesis, but evolution and God; and that is the vital topic. The title is *Through Evolution to the Living God* (Parker; 3s. 6d. net).

It is not long since President Taft returned from unveiling a monument at Provincetown, Mass., to the Pilgrim Fathers. But there are other monuments than those in stone. British publishers—Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons—have issued a volume which is not less beautiful in workmanship, and may last longer. It contains no fewer than forty-eight full-page illustrations. Each illustration is printed in brown on separate paper and enclosed in a light green border. The same border runs round the pages of letterpress. The author of the book is Mr. A. C. Addison, who explains that his object is to give the reader an account of the *Mayflower* pilgrims which is concise and yet sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all essentials respecting the personality and pilgrimage of the Fathers whom Whittier pictures to us as:

> those brave men who brought
> To the ice and iron of our winter time
> A will as firm, a creed as stern, and wrought
> With one mailed hand and with the other fought.

The title of the book is *The Romantic Story of the Mayflower Pilgrims, and its Place in the Life of To-day* (7s. 6d. net).

Mr. J. Arthur Hill's *Religion and Modern Psychology* (Rider; 3s. 6d. net) is not a book of hard scientific fact, but it gives us the best survey we have yet had, short and intelligible, of what has been accomplished by psychical research. Mr. Hill thinks that the survival of the individual after death has been proved, and that the proof has come through our bodily sensations. But he is not by any means dogmatic about it. All he says is that 'things certainly happen which recognized scientific theories will not cover, and some of these happenings are best explained by the hypothesis of the continued existence and agency of disembodied minds.' Has psychical research told us anything of the life which 'disembodied minds' live? He thinks it has. It is a life of latitudinarianism. It is 'an emphatic protest against theological bigotry and dogmatism of all kinds.' Again, 'there is no sudden unalloyed bliss for the good.' The bad go on trying to be not so bad, and the good try to be better. Nor is there any immediate access of happiness, though the disembodied mind hopes

that that will come. In the other world as in this, according to psychical research,

Man never is but always to be blest.

In short, according to psychical research, there is nothing new over the sun any more than under it.

Falling Upwards is the title (within quotation marks) which the Rev. F. W. Orde Ward, B.A., Oxford, has given to his new book (Simpkin; 5s. net). It is a phrase of consummate cleverness, and used quite legitimately by Leibniz. But it has come to grief of late. 'Falling upwards,' as a description of sin, is a moral outrage which the conscience of even the hardiest sinner will not accept. But Mr. Orde Ward is no latitudinarian. With a skill in paradox which Mr. Chesterton himself would not always surpass, he is a sound theologian. Listen to what he says about perfection. 'But what do we mean by Perfection? The apparent paradox, but profound truth, that the impossible is the only possible aim for man. "If it be impossible, it shall be done." Christ does not enlist us in His service simply to fight the difficulties or overcome hardships, or even to die daily, as all must do who grow spiritually, because these are comparatively easy tasks. No, but He bids us repent and believe and love, and make others' causes our own and live in them and for them—which we can no more do by nature than we can fly without aeroplanes. He provides us with a new moral centre of gravity, namely, the Cross. To be perfect, then, is to have reached an end. And in our case, it means the acceptance of His law. We can be perfect now potentially—*complete in Him.* Practically we are not and never shall be on earth. But then Christ accepts the will for the deed, the good intention for the fact, the promise for the performance, the ideal for the real and actual. His accomplishment is made over to us, and we rest in His finished work.'

The fifty-fifth volume of *Great Thoughts from Master Minds* (Smith's Pub. Co.) is the first volume of the seventh series. The editor in his preface quotes Charles Reade, who said that he was 'a setter of diamonds.' The editor has sought to be a setter of diamonds also. There is just one thing that would make the book more valuable. It is that the editor would tell us exactly whence he has taken his quotations.

Read books, not books about books. With one exception. Read *Bookland* (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net), by Miss Grace Lambert, though it is a book about books. For it is itself a book.

Is there any great writer of our day of whose personality and doctrine the impression is more indefinite than Tolstoy? His books are a vast cathedral. We need a guide to interpret the several parts and to point out the unity that they lead to. The Rev. Alexander H. Craufurd, M.A., has constituted himself our guide. Already successful as an interpreter of James Martineau and H. G. Wells, he has been encouraged to undertake this mightier task. If we do not understand Tolstoy after reading Mr. Craufurd's book, it must be because Tolstoy is unintelligible. For Mr. Craufurd has manifestly studied him through and through, and writes with most refreshing clearness. Perhaps it is only another Tolstoy that could understand Tolstoy utterly. Mr. Craufurd, though sympathetic, does not believe that Tolstoy's system is consistent, and he does not believe that it would be workable if it were. Is it possible that Mr. Craufurd takes too short a view? Tolstoy's vision is always of the land of far distances. The title of the book is *The Religion and Ethics of Tolstoy* (Fisher Unwin; 3s. 6d. net).

Christ and Human Need is the title of a volume of addresses delivered at a Conference on Foreign Missions and Social Problems at Liverpool in January 1912. Mr. Harry Bisseker has an address in it on 'Social Facts and Spiritual Issues,' and Professor Cairns has one on 'Coming Religious Changes in the Far East' (Student Volunteer Missionary Union; 2s. net).

The editor of the *Hibbert Journal*, whatever may be said of him as an editor, claims and deserves the reputation of an author. Men may ask what the *Hibbert Journal* stands for; they are in no doubt as to what Mr. Jacks means in his essays. His theology is the theology of Faber:

There's a wideness in God's mercy
Like the wideness of the sea.

And every paper, whatever its form, reads the attractive lesson that it is not possible for any one to pass beyond the sweep of God's white raiment.

Now such a creed as a protest against a narrow orthodoxy is both beautiful and inevitable. We read Faber and reverence him. But is not the orthodoxy of the present day wide enough? Are we not now in imminent danger of approaching God indifferently and indiscriminately, as we might approach a benevolent old gentleman who is too indulgent to see that we are to blame and too soft-hearted to blame us if he saw? The prodigal goes out into the far country and spends his substance in riotous living. Mr. Jacks seems to say that it scarcely matters. Does he think it matters at all when the end comes? But Jesus said, 'This my son was dead.' The prodigal had to return, saying 'Father, I have sinned,' before the Father could say, 'and is alive again.' In the scenes of Mr. Jacks's new book *Among the Idolmakers* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net) there is human error enough. Is God really looking on all the while so complacently?

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., Professor of Assyriology, Oxford.

Chapter vi.

9, 10. Here we have another extract from the book of generations, or series of tablets called *annâti talidât*. It would seem to have been the third tablet of the series, which followed 5^{31}, to which v.^{32} has been appended by the Hebrew writer. Consequently the words, 'these are the generations,' will have been derived from the colophon of the tablet: *duppu III; Annâti talidât*, '3rd tablet of *Annâti talidât*,' and the extract would not necessarily contain a list of Noah's generations or descendants. And this, in fact, is the case. There are no generations of Noah, only the one generation of his three sons; cf. 25^{19}. Hence the original would have been: 'And Noah lived (500?) years, and begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. And Noah walked with God after he had begotten his sons, 450 (?) years (and begat sons and daughters). And all the days of Noah were 950 years: and he died.' The last sentence has been transferred to 9^{29}. That Noah should be said to have 'walked with God,' like Enoch, is explained by the fact that, according to the Babylonian version, it was Utu-napistim, and not Enwe-dhuranki, who was translated to live 'among the gods'; see note on 5^{24}. Perhaps, therefore, the original had, instead of 'he died,' 'he was not, for God took him.' In any case, the repetition of the name Noah and the want of the copulative conjunction raises the presumption that the words, 'Noah was a just man, perfect in his generations,' were a marginal note which has made its way into the text. *Ẓaddîq*, 'righteous,' is the Ass. *isaru*, but as a title of the hero of the Deluge it replaces *atra-khaśiś*, 'the very wise,' in the Deluge story. While, according to the Babylonian story, it was the wisdom of Utu-napistim which made Ea, the god of wisdom, reveal to him the coming catastrophe, Yahweh's revelation to Noah was due to the latter's righteousness. Once more there is an intentional correction of the Babylonian version on the part of the Hebrew writer. Yahweh demanded not only wisdom, but also righteousness; Babylonian polytheism divided the divine attributes among different gods. 'A righteous man' and 'he was upright in his generations' are alternative renderings of the Ass. *isaru ina amelûti*, 'upright among men.' The Septuagint corrects, 'in his generation'; but the correction is needless, since the patriarch or hero lived through several generations of ordinary men.

11. The Assyrian would be *irtsitu limnit* (or *śukhkhupat*) *lapâni ilâni; irtsitu mikhtsi* (or *limutti*) *malat*. The earth had been pronounced good ($1^{10.31}$), but murder had brought upon it a curse, the Babylonian *arrat limuttim*, also called *qûlu lâ dhâbu*, 'voice of evil' (as in $4^{10\text{-}12}$). Hence, like the animals, it was to share in the punishment of the Deluge. Here, again, there is an implicit condemnation of Babylonian polytheism, which made the earth a goddess, whose name, Irtsitu, is compounded with those of Western Semites in the Khammu-rabi period. In the Epic of Gilgames the

Earth is put on a level with Namtaru, 'Destiny,' and regarded as 'taking' mankind from life. The Hebrew writer, on the other hand, degrades Earth, the goddess who inflicts death, to 'the earth' which shares in the corruption, and consequently in the punishment, of the men who inhabit it. Like Tiamât, it becomes the enemy of the deity (*limnit lapâni ilâni*), full of 'violence,' like the forces of Tiamât. The passage seems to be taken from a poem, since its Assyrian equivalent is in the form of a verse.

12. This verse is a commentary on the preceding one. When God sees the earth (*irtsitam inadhdhal* in Assyrian), it has become corrupt, because the living beings upon it—who were formed of its dust, and returned at death to its bosom—were corrupt and hostile to God. In the Epic of Gilgames, 'the law of the Earth' (*urtim irtsitim*) is declared to be that mortal man is formed from the dust, and shall 'sink back' into it (*ina epiri ittapalsikh*). In v.[3] man had already been pronounced to be 'flesh,' and in v.[7] the lower animals had been stated to be involved in the judgment that was coming upon man. Just as v.[7] refers us to 1^{28}, so this verse refers us to 2^{7}.

13. The earth had become corrupt and ruined, so God will now ruin it. The play on the Hebrew word reproduces the Assyrian *irtsitam ulammenu*, 'I will destroy the earth,' where there is the same play on *limnit* and *ulammenu*, though perhaps the original text had *aśkhup*, 'I will destroy,' since *śikhiptu*, 'the destruction,' is given as a synonym of *bubbulu*, 'the deluge' (see note on 6^{17}). In the Babylonian story of the Deluge, however, the word actually used is *khulluq* (*ana khulluq nisi-ya*, 'to destroy my men'). The Hebrew text has 'I will destroy them, (namely) the earth,' where the Septuagint has endeavoured to make sense by inserting 'and' after 'them.' 'The earth,' however, must be a marginal gloss, derived from the Babylonian original; the Hebrew writer was explaining that the reference to 'the earth' meant the living creatures upon it. Hence we may conclude that, in the original tablet, v.[11] (or 12^{a}) was followed by v.[13], which ran: 'And God said unto Noah: The fated period of all flesh is come before me, and behold, I will destroy the earth.' The explanation of what was meant by the earth obliged the Hebrew scribe to substitute 'them' for 'the earth' at the end of the verse.

The Septuagint is right in reading καιρὸς, 'period,' for 'end.' The Babylonian original had *adannu*, as in the story of the Deluge (l. 87), *adanna Samas iskunamma*, 'the fated period did the Sun-god fix,' and (l. 90) *adannu sû iktalda*, 'that fated period arrived,' and would have been *adannu sa kullat nisi ana mukhkhi-ya issakin*.

14. In the Babylonian story of the Deluge the command of Ea to Utu-napistim is: 'Fashion a house, build a ship,' and in the account of its construction it is said to have been divided into nine rooms, and to have been pitched within and without. The Heb. *kopher*, 'pitch,' is borrowed from the Babylonian *kupru*. The stoneless plain of Babylonia was the first home of building with brick, and the bitumen springs at Hit and on the eastern side of the Tigris supplied the builders with mortar.

Bayît, 'within,' answers to the *bîtu*, 'house,' of Ea's command. Later on in the Babylonian story, the Chaldæan ship is called an *êkallu*, or 'palace.' The wood of which it was built is not stated in the Babylonian account. What is meant by 'gopher-wood' is unknown; the Septuagint translates, 'square logs.' In an Assyrian lexical tablet (K 169) mention is made of the tree *kuptarru*, which is said to be also called *kaptaru*, reminding us of Caphtor, the Hebrew name of Krete. Both *gubru* and *kapru* mean a 'plate' or 'table.'

The 'ark' (*têbâh*), which replaces the Babylonian 'ship,' is Palestinian, Palestine being a country without navigable rivers (cf. note on 1^{11}). Similarly, the members of Osiris were said to have come to Byblos (Gebal) in a chest. The word *têbâh* seems to have been borrowed from the Egyptian *deb*, *teb*, or *tebt*, 'a chest.'

15. Ea's instructions to Utu-napistim were—

> The ship which thou buildest, even thou,
> let its size be so planned
> that its breadth and its length be proportionate,

where *mitkhur* ('proportionate') probably means that the length and breadth should be the same, like those of the modern *kufa*, which is used on the Tigris and Euphrates; but it may signify only that their proportions were similar.

In the account of the building of the ship we read:

> According to the plan, 120 cubits high were its sides,
> 120 cubits was the width of its roof.
> I planked its side and closed it in;
> I completed it in 6 storeys (?);
> I divided its . . . into 7 parts;

its interior did I divide into 9 rooms;
a mast (?) in the middle of it I planted;
I looked to the rudder and added what was wanting;
6 *sari* of pitch I poured over the hull;
3 *sari* of bitumen [I poured] over the interior.

The Hebrew ark needed, of course, no mast or rudder. The proportions of a chest, moreover, were necessarily not the same as those of a ship. Hence, in passing from Babylonia to Palestine, the account of the size of the vessel underwent alteration. Its length and breadth were no longer proportionate, the length being half a *ner* of cubits, and the breadth fifty cubits, a measurement which is no longer Babylonian, but Egypto-Palestinian. When the measurement of the breadth was changed in order to make the Hebrew ark conformable to the shape of a chest or Egyptian box, the number of cubits in which it was expressed ceased to be Babylonian, and became Egyptian. The height remained the Babylonian measure of half a *soss* of cubits, a fourth part of the height of the Babylonian ship. Perhaps, therefore, the reduction in the length of the vessel was the same; in this case, the ship of Utu-napistim would have been 1200 cubits long, but it was more probably 300. The Heb. word *ammâh*, 'cubit,' like the measure it denoted, was borrowed from Babylonia.

16. The *paseq* attached to *zohar*, A.V. 'window,' shows that the meaning of the word was doubtful to the Massoretes. The Septuagint translators were equally puzzled by it, and their rendering, ἐπισυνάγων, 'narrowing,' seems to indicate that they corrected it into *ṣa'îr*. Professor Jensen has pointed out that it is the *tsuhru* and *tsukhru* of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, which in Winckler (157. 11) is given as the Canaanite equivalent of the Ass. *tsiru*, 'back.' Hence the word will signify the back-like roof of the ark, which, like that of most Egyptian chests, resembled the roof of an English house. The Babylonian vessel also had a 'roof.'

What is meant by the phrase 'thou shalt finish it (the ark) above at a cubit' is not clear. Perhaps it is a translation of the common Assyrian expression: 'so many cubits' *ina* i. *ammati*, 'according to a cubit-measure'; literally, 'in a cubit.' If so, the phrase would signify that no fractions of the cubit were to be used, but that the dimensions of the ark when completed should represent accurately aggregates of cubits only. In any case the ark, it would seem, was to be built from the bottom upwards.

The Babylonian vessel also had a door which Utu-napistim closed when he entered it. On the other hand, the six storeys of the Babylonian account are halved in the case of the Hebrew ark in accordance with its otherwise reduced dimensions. These reduced dimensions, it may be noticed, correspond with the reduced number of years assigned in Genesis to the antediluvian patriarchs when compared with the antediluvian kings of Babylonia.

17. Once more the Hebrew writer emphasizes the fact that the Deluge was brought upon the earth by the same God as He who revealed its approach to Noah. Once more, therefore, there is a silent condemnation of Babylonian polytheism. The Heb. text has '*the* flood of waters,' indicating that it was a well-known event. Zimmern is doubtless right in holding that *mabbûl*, 'flood,' is borrowed from the Ass. *bubbulu*, which is given as a synonym of *abubu*, 'the deluge,' as well as of *śikhiptu*, 'destruction,' the equivalent of the Heb. ישחת. Both the word and the event would have been well known in pre-mosaic Canaan where Babylonian literature was studied and the Babylonian language and script learnt in the schools. For 'waters,' see note on 7^6.

'All flesh wherein is the breath of life,' answers to *zîr napsâti kalama*, 'the seed of life of every kind,' in the Babylonian version, the variation in the words being due to the reference to 1^7 $6^{3.12}$. But the sense is the same; hence 'the breath of life' is not restricted to man as in 1^7 6^3, but includes the animal creation as in 6^7.[1] 'Everything which is in the land,' not 'earth,' since the destruction did not extend to the vegetable creation. The olive was still in leaf when the waters abated.

18. Here, as in Gn 1, there is an implicit contradiction of the polytheistic Babylonian story. The 'covenant' which was made after the descent from the ark and Noah's sacrifice to Yahweh (9^{9-17}) corresponds with the covenant made under the same circumstances between Ellil (Bel) and Utu-napistim. It was Ellil who had sent the Deluge and with whom the covenant with Utu-napistim was finally made. But it was not Ellil who had warned Utu-napistim of the approaching

[1] The expression 'breath of life' seems to have been specially Canaanite, like the use of the plural *ilâni* for the singular *ilu*, 'god,' since the Tel el-Amarna writers address the Pharaoh as *sari napisti-ya*, 'the breath of my life.'

catastrophe and told him to build the ark, but Ea, whose intercession alone saved the Chaldæan hero from destruction and made the covenant possible. The Hebrew writer, however, here emphasizes the fact not only that the author of the Deluge and the preserver of Noah were the same, but also that in bidding him build the ark this one God declared at the same time that He would make a covenant with him. The polytheism of the Babylonian story is thus tacitly denied.

17–22. This passage is a variant of 7^{1-6}. In the Assyro-Babylonian Epic of the Creation long passages are similarly repeated at different moments of the story, and the same characteristic recurs in other Babylonian legends. We may, therefore, have here a reproduction of Babylonian literary usage. But, on the other hand, we may have variant free renderings of the same cuneiform original, just as elsewhere we have alternative renderings, side by side, of the same Babylonian word (*e.g.* Gn 4^{22}). In favour of this are the words with which both passages conclude (6^{22} 7^{5}), as well as the fact that a little further on ($7^{7-10.\ 13-17}$) we find another duplicate passage which can best be explained as due to variant translations. Against this explanation is the dislocation of 6^{17} when compared with 7^{4}. In any case the entrance of Noah into the ark is regarded in the two passages from different points of view: while 7^{1-5} refers us to the Mosaic Law with its division of animals into the clean and unclean, 6^{17-22} takes us back to Gn 1.

The variations in the order of the words—'thou shalt come into the ark, thou and thy' family, 'come thou and all thy house into the ark,' etc.—are instructive, and throw light upon the method of translation from Babylonian or Israelitish cuneiform texts. So, too, are the paraphrastic explanations of words or expressions; 'all thy house,' for example, being resolved into 'thy sons, and thy wives, and the wives of thy sons.' The Babylonian Epic has simply 'my family, and my wives.' But it adds to these the 'craftsmen' who had constructed the ark; to the Hebrew writer Cain, the Smith, belonged to the accursed race whom it was the object of the Deluge to destroy. Hence the family of Noah alone was admitted into the Hebrew ark; nor did it need a steersman like the Babylonian vessel.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Two Important Works by Professor König.[1]

1. A NEW Hebrew Lexicon by so competent a Hebraist as Dr. König will be very welcome to O.T. scholars and students. It will supersede the admirable work of Siegfried-Stade, which is now somewhat out of date, and which had the very serious defect of almost entirely omitting the etymological element which is so important. It will appeal to many who cannot afford to procure the great *Oxford Heb. Lexicon*, and even those who possess the latter will thankfully give Professor König's work a place alongside it. To a very large class of students a welcome feature of the new Lexicon will be the fact that the Heb. words are dealt with alphabetically and not etymologically, as in the Oxford Lexicon. This will save much time to those who consult its pages. Moreover, any forms that are difficult to recognize are analyzed in their alphabetical place, and the Massoretical notes are explained. The thoroughness and up-to-date character of the work are illustrated by the fact that the Aramaic part of the Lexicon contains not only the words found in the O.T. but all the most important terms that occur in the recently discovered texts of Assuan and Elephantine. Special attention is bestowed on the development in meaning of Heb. words, and copious references are made to the usage in the cognate languages. The Assyriological and other literary data are fully given, and the author is not content, as too many are, simply to cite an authority, but is careful *to indicate what that authority contains.* Alike for its practical use and for its scientific value, which is of the highest, Professor König's Lexicon merits the warmest commendation.

[1] (1) *Heb. und aram. Wörterbuch zum A.T.; mit Einschaltung u. Analyse aller schwer erkennbaren Formen, Deutung der Eigennamen sowie der massor. Randbemerkungen, u. einem deutsch-heb. Wortregister.* Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Price M.11.

(2) *Gesch. der Alttest. Religion kritisch dargestellt.* Gütersloh: Druck u. Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. Price M.7, bound M.8.

2. The Religion of Israel is a subject of perennial interest, and, in spite of all that has been written upon it, any fresh contribution to its elucidation is welcome. In the work before us Professor König has gathered up the results of many years of careful and patient study. His standpoint, which is that of a progressive, yet sane and cautious, criticism, is sufficiently familiar to readers of his previous works, who will be thankful to have so competent a guide to lead them through the labyrinth of modern theories of the origin and development of the O.T. religion. Nowadays we have not only the 'traditional' and the 'critical' theory, but a modified traditionalism represented in our own country by Professor Orr, and a variety of theories difficult to classify, like those of Sayce, and Hommel, and Gunkel, not to speak of the more recent hypotheses—some of them revolutionary enough—of men like Jahn and Eerdmans and Drews. We have to deal also with those who discover astral myths at every turn — chiefly Winckler and A. Jeremias—and with such a champion of Panbabylonism as Friedrich Delitzsch. All these theories are sufficiently examined in the volume before us. The author follows the convenient plan of giving his own views in paragraphs printed in ordinary type, while other views, whether agreeing with or diverging from them, are dealt with in paragraphs that are interspersed in smaller type. The reader may thus, if he cares to do so, first go consecutively through Dr. König's own views, and then return and examine the evidence for himself. It is scarcely necessary to say that the author is scrupulously fair to his opponents, avoiding entirely those personalities that so often disfigure the pages even of scientific works. His object is simply to place at the disposal of his readers the evidence in full, and, while stating clearly his own views, to enable them to form conclusions for themselves. It would not be fair, even if it were possible within our limits of space, to summarize the conclusions of Professor König, but we may indicate the general plan of the work, in the assurance that readers will be induced to turn their attention to it.

The book falls into two main divisions, the first of which (pp. 26–118) is entitled 'Der Ursprung der Religion Israels,' and contains four chapters. Of these the third and fourth, entitled respectively 'Fragliche Vorstufen der israel. Religion' and 'Die positiven Fermente u. Triebkräfte beim Ursprung der legitimen Rel. Israels' are of special importance. Here we find full discussions of such subjects as Totemism, Ancestor-worship, Fetishism, the alleged monotheism of the Semites in general, henotheism, etc. The second main division, which forms much the larger part of the book (pp. 119–579), includes also four chapters. It is entitled 'Die Entfaltung der Religion Israels.' The first chapter is one of much interest, dealing as it does with the 'patriarchal' stage of O.T. religion. The question of the historical existence of the patriarchs is very carefully examined. In this section we are very glad to see the 'polytheistic' notions of Eerdmans rejected for reasons that are thoroughly convincing. In chapter vi. full justice is done to the personality and work of Moses. Here we have most valuable discussions, for instance, of the meaning of the name *Jahweh*, and the Kenite and other theories of the origin of Jahweh-worship. Chapter vii. brings us to the era of the writing prophets. Of special importance here are the treatment of 'ethical monotheism,' the discussion of Josiah's reformation and the part played therein by the Book of Deuteronomy, and the illuminating characterization of the special mission of Jeremiah. The concluding chapter introduces us to the period of the Scribes, and exhibits the prominence given to the Law, the part played by the Wisdom literature, and the significance of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, etc. The value of Professor König's volume is materially enhanced by two excellent indexes—one of subjects, the other of Scripture and other texts cited.

J. A. Selbie.

Aberdeen.

Valentinianism.[1]

This volume, which appears as Part xxxvii. 3 of the well-known *Texte und Untersuchungen*, is a fresh discussion of the subject dealt with by G. Heinrici in his important monograph, *Die Valentinianische Gnosis u. die Heilige Schrift*, published forty years ago. The critical investigation of the sources carried on since then by Lipsius, Zahn, Von Arnim, and others, together with the immense increase of knowledge regarding those factors which created the highly syncretistic movement designated as Gnosticism, have certainly paved the

[1] *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis.* Von Lic. C. Barth. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1911. Pp. iv, 118. Price M.4.

way for a new examination of Valentinian exegesis. The result is a compact, scholarly, informing dissertation.

The author does not profess to make any original contribution to source-criticism. But he gives a concise and interesting survey of the more probable results. For probability is all that can be attained in this perplexing field of research. One of the more important hypotheses which he seeks to establish is that of the large dependence of Irenæus, our chief patristic authority for Valentinian Gnosticism, on a work of Ptolemæus, the leading teacher of the Western Valentinian school (pp. 12–21). In this direction he goes much further, *e.g.*, than Lipsius.

Barth leads up to the subject proper by an examination of New Testament quotations in the surviving fragments of Valentinian documents. Here the problem is complicated owing to the difficulty of determining whether Clement, Irenæus, and Hippolytus have altered Valentinian readings in the material which they alone have preserved. In any case, many of the quotations exhibit readings obviously typical of the school: *e.g.* Ro 8^{20} (*Excerpt.* 49[1]), *ὑπετάγη τῇ ματαιότητι τοῦ κόσμου οὐχ ἑκών, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.*, where *ἑκοῦσα* is changed to masculine *ἑκών* and referred to the Demiurge, and *κτίσις* omitted as synonymous with him. Yet these alterations are insignificant as compared with the mutilations made by Marcion.

The main content of the discussion is to be found in chap. vi. ('Soteriological Interpretation of the Redemptive Facts of the Life of Jesus') and chap. vii. ('Allegorical Interpretation of Scripture'). These chapters might quite well have been thrown together as their material overlaps. The interpretation of the earthly life of Jesus is characteristic of the Valentinian standpoint. Valentinus had shaped his system with far closer affinities to Platonism than to the Oriental Dualism which lay at the basis of the vulgar Gnosticism. Hence the career of Jesus is merely the visible representation of great metaphysical processes. Thus, *e.g.*, the star of Bethlehem is not a mere light to guide the Magi. As it shines in the heavens, it is the higher aspect of the Saviour who is born on earth. As a redemptive agency, it crushes the power of the star-spirits to whose rule (*εἱμαρμένη*) men were subject (pp. 46–47). Barth gives some good illustrations of this phase of belief from contemporary literature, but these notes would have gained by a more orderly arrangement of material. It is exceedingly doubtful whether star-spirits can be found in Ro 8^{38} (p. 48, n. 2).

It was, of course, inevitable that exegetes with the pre-suppositions of the Valentinian school should apply the allegorical method. According to a highly probable tradition, Valentinus had been brought up in Egypt, one of the chief centres of allegorical interpretation. Hence the method is adopted in passages which seem to lower the dignity of the Saviour (*e.g.* Lk 9^{22}), which contain difficult expressions (*e.g.* 1 Co 11^{10}), which contradict other parts of Scripture (*e.g.* Jn $1^{23f.}$), or whose language suggests Valentinian conceptions (*e.g.*, the use of *σοφία*). The key to this science of interpretation is to be found in Gnosis. And we may note, in passing, a very remarkable description of the contents of Gnosis found in *Excerpt.* 78 (cited by Barth): *ἡ γνῶσις, τίνες ἦμεν, τί γεγόναμεν· ποῦ ἦμεν [ἢ] ποῦ ἐνεβλήθημεν· ποῦ σπεύδομεν, πόθεν λυτρούμεθα, τί γέννησις, τί ἀναγέννησις.* The author rightly emphasizes the revelation-element in this conception (p. 53). It is almost unnecessary to point out that the words of Jesus are usually interpreted in the light of those cosmological doctrines which were so popular in Gnosticism. A good example of Valentinian exegesis is that of the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Coin. The sheep which goes astray is Sophia, which has wandered from the Pleroma into all the sufferings and illusions of the Hysterema, and cannot of itself find its way home. The woman who has lost the coin and rejoices to find it, suggests to the Valentinian the *ἄνω Σοφία*, which, in the final age, finds again its Enthymesis, which, as Sophia Achamoth, had remained behind in the Kenoma (p. 60). An extraordinary instance is the exposition of Jesus' talk with the Samaritan woman (p. 79 f.). The twelve Apostles take the place of the twelve star-spirits. We are reminded of some of Jensen's constructions of the New Testament as a Gilgamesch-Epos.

Here and there the author adduces what seem to him parallels from Paul, which are utterly irrelevant, as, *e.g.*, when he compares 1 Co 1^{16}, Ph 3^{18}, and Gal 6^{14} to the Valentinian conception of the heavenly *ὅρος σταυρός*, in which *σταυρός* appears as a personal being (p. 86, n. 1). But, as a rule, the investigation is conducted with caution and balance of judgment.

H. A. A. Kennedy.

New College, Edinburgh.

Contributions and Comments.

Psalm xxxi. 20.

I WONDER that my friend, Professor Nestle, whose reading is so wide, is unaware that 'the covert of thy wings' has been already proposed by Goldziher and by myself. See Goldziher, *Der Mythos*, p. 137; Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, 1904, vol. i. p. 132.

T. K. CHEYNE.

Oxford.

Phœbe.

A COMRADE of mine in mission work, to whom I lend my motor car occasionally for its purposes, said to me lately, that the car ought to be called *Phœbe*, for it is *a succourer of many*. Now this idea seems to me to be a misapprehension, due to our Authorized Version, where, in Ro 16[1], the translators have followed their pre-conceived opinions rather than the sense of the Greek; and, strange to say, the Revisers have meekly adopted the same phraseology, correcting it in the margin. A 'servant,' a 'succourer,' have led many of us to picture Phœbe as a sort of blend of a pew-opener, so to speak, or caretaker, with a district nurse; at least these are the functions which we more or less consciously attribute to her. This is not borne out in the original. Phœbe is first called διάκονος, by the same name as is translated 'deacon' when applied to church officials of the other sex, as in Ph 1[1] and 1 Ti 3[8], and 'servant' when used of persons privately, including St. Paul and our Lord Himself. There is therefore some colour in this verse for the supposition that women had a position in the management of Church affairs. Secondly, Phœbe is called προστατις, a word in which the idea of 'succour' is quite subordinate. Its root-meaning is patronage or protection. Phœbe was evidently a Lady Bountiful. May we not conclude that she played the blessed part of hostess to the Apostle when he stayed at Cenchrea?

The whole world is her debtor for the service she did it in faithfully carrying St. Paul's letter with her on her journey to Rome. Through her hands have been transmitted some of our most precious oracles. It is well, then, that we should have a true idea of the honourable position she held, probably in the Church as well as in the world.

MARGARET D. GIBSON.

Cambridge.

The Good and the Beautiful.

IT is not generally noticed, perhaps not generally known, that in the N.T. 'good' is used to represent two different words, ἀγαθός and καλός, the first simply 'good,' the second 'surpassingly good.' The two words are akin, but not synonymous. The beautiful, fair, excellent (καλός) is good in the superlative degree. The beautiful is good, but the converse is not necessarily true. It is unfortunate that the difference cannot be marked in the English Version, for thus a prime distinction in Scripture teaching is concealed.

The two words occur about the same number of times, each about a hundred times (see Moulton and Geden's Concordance). Both terms are naturally applied to the tree and fruit. Καλός is applied also to the soil, seed, works, salt, wine, the shepherd, the law, the fight, minister, soldier, warfare, conscience, conversation in the sense of conduct, pearls ('goodly,' Mt 13[45]), and many others. In one case the two words occur together, 'an honest and good heart' (Lk 8[15]). The moral meaning is specially apparent in the frequent contrast of good and evil works ('beautiful works,' Mt 5[16]). Of the two words the use of καλός somewhat preponderates. In the third Gospel and in Romans ἀγαθός preponderates. In Matthew the two terms are about equally distributed.

We have said that our inability to reproduce the difference between the two words is unfortunate, for undoubtedly the Christian life is always represented not merely as the good, but as the beautiful, admirable, lovable life (καλός, not merely ἀγαθός). It is the complete, perfect, noble life (Mt 5[48]). One who answers to this description is a normal Christian, not exceptional. The entire tenor of N.T. teaching respecting Christian character and conduct is such as to require a special term like καλός to describe it. The ordinary term would not be enough. Christian goodness is goodness in the superlative, not the positive, degree. The portrait

of Christian character in the Beatitudes (Mt 5) bears out this. Each grace goes beyond the simply good. Although one grace may be more conspicuous in some cases than the others, all are present, and all describe or imply inner dispositions, virtues of the inner life. The two great commandments present the same high ideal. In the first one the emphasis is first on 'love,' and secondly on the enhancing words 'with all thy heart.' In the second commandment 'as thyself' is far-reaching. The ethical teaching of chapters like Ro 12 and 13 is on the same high plane. '*Abhor* that which is evil, *cleave to* that which is good' (τῷ ἀγαθῷ) is much more than 'good.' In v.[17] 'things honourable' well represents καλά. Vv.[20. 21] reproduce Christ's teaching in Mt 5[44-48]. Chap. 13[8-10] reaches the same height, Gal 5[22] is in the same key, love leading the procession of godlike virtues. 2 P 1[5-7] is worthy to stand beside any Pauline list of graces. 'Faith' is the beginning, 'love' the crown of Christian goodness. All this, again, is comprised and exceeded in 1 Co 13. In each verse goodness is raised to its highest power, and the entire picture stands for the 'goal' of Ph 3[14]. In Ph 4[8] Paul is at a loss to find words weighty enough to set forth the Christian ideal ('honourable,' σεμνά, 'lovely,' προσφιλῆ). These instances are enough to show that the lofty type of Christian character explains the special term used so often as a substitute for 'good.'

It may be said that the N.T. standard is only an unrealized ideal. On the contrary, it is a realized ideal. The Son, the perfect man, is 'the firstborn among many brethren.' With good reason the Christian life is often spoken of as the following or imitation of Christ. With conversion or regeneration the spirit or mind of Christ is planted in the believer. The living proofs are not merely the saintly heroes of the Christian life, who have drunk most deeply of the spirit of self-sacrificing love and service. These are numerous enough. But the unknown saints in humble life, who have 'put on the Lord Jesus Christ,' in whose unselfish, self-denying lives Christ is seen as plainly as in the Gospels, who do Christ's work and tread in His steps, are more numerous still. Christ's religion and Christ's people pass His own test, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'

J. S. Banks.

Leeds.

Hadadezer, King of Syria.

In a recent number of this journal,[1] Dr. Langdon published a translation of a new text of Shalmaneser II.[2] which, he believes, confirms the historicity of 2 K 8[7-15]. In the course of his discussion he rejects the conclusions I arrived at in an article entitled 'Benhadad and Hadadezer' which appeared in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, April 1911. Since that article has been reviewed in this journal[3] by Mr. P. S. P. Handcock, B.A., Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum, it will be sufficient to state here that I advanced the hypothesis that the *unnamed* king of Syria of 1 K 22 was not the same person as the Benhadad of chap. 20, but that his name was *Hadadezer*, and that he was the $^{\text{dlu}}$*IM-idri* mentioned in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II. I thought I had proved that the name $^{\text{dlu}}$*IM-idri* could only be read *Adad-idri*, that is, *Hadadezer*.

Since the philological arguments on which I based my conclusions cover some eight very dry pages of my article, to which I refer the curious, I will be pardoned for limiting myself in this place to a discussion of the reading *Pir-idri* proposed by Dr. Langdon, and to a few remarks on the historical questions raised by the new text which he has translated.

Will reading the name $^{\text{dlu}}$*IM-idri* as *Pir-idri* account for the Hebrew Benhadad (פר־הדר=בר־הדר=בן־הדד)?

In proposing the reading *Pir-idri* for $^{\text{dlu}}$*IM-idri*, Dr. Langdon believes that he is reviving a reading proposed by Delitzsch, held by Winckler, and lately accepted by Zimmern. But the reading of these men is *Bir-idri* not *Pir-idri*, and furthermore, Delitzsch has tacitly abandoned the reading.[4] In my article I took up all the names whether in the Cuneiform, Aramaic or Hebrew, which had been brought forward to prove the existence of a West Semitic god named *Bir* (בר); and I believed that I had shown beyond a doubt that no such name occurs in the published inscriptions. Evidently Dr. Langdon believes that I overlooked the fact that

[1] November 1911, 'Pir-idri (Benhadad) King of Syria,' p. 68 f.

[2] No. 30 of Messerschmidt, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur*, Leipzig, 1911.

[3] May 1911, 'Identification of an Unnamed Old Testament King,' p. 370 f.

[4] *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii. p. 642.

Pir is a reading of the ideogram ^{ilu}IM. On page 271 of my article may be found my reasons for rejecting *Pir* as a possible reading of the ideogram ^{ilu}IM in the name ^{ilu}IM-*idri*. It was because there is no evidence that *Pir* was one of the names by which *Adad* (= ^{ilu}IM) was known *in the west*, Amurru, that is, Syria. Let me make this clear by a quotation from the page in question.

'In vols. xxiv. and xxv. of the *Cuneiform Texts in the British Museum*, Mr. King has published extensive lists of Babylonian-Assyrian deities compiled by the Babylonian priests, in which are given the different names by which these deities were known, their attributes, as well as the current identifications of foreign with Babylonian deities. So, for example, in vol. xxv., pl. 16, we have a list of names by which the god *IM* was known. In l. 16 he is identified with *Addu*, and in the next line with *Dadu*, while explanatory notes add that these were his names in Amurru. Now Amurru was the general name for Syria-Palestine in the Assyrian period of Old Testament history, in which period these lists of deities were compiled. In the same place we also find ^{ilu}IM identified with the god *Tešub* of Subartu (roughly speaking, Mesopotamia), the Cassite god *Buriaš*, and others. . . . We have thus more than sixty names which are identified with ^{ilu}IM, including the well-known names of the West Semitic weather-god *Adad* (Hebrew Hadad), *Adad*, *Dadu*, as well as *Amurru* (MAR-TU). As already stated, these lists have explanatory notes in connexion with the names of foreign deities identified with ^{ilu}IM.'

Now there is no such explanatory note added to the reading *Pir* to indicate that this name of *Adad* was current in the *west*, a possibility, however, to which I called attention in the footnote to the page.

But the chief reason for rejecting the reading *Bir* or *Pir-idri* = ^{ilu}IM-*idri* lies in the second element of the name, *i.e. idri*. To this element scholars, including Dr. Langdon, have paid little attention. In my discussion I called attention to the large number of Mesopotamian personal names of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., such as *Atar-idri*, *Bêl-ḫarrâni-idri*, *Ilu-idri*, *Milki-idri*, *Samsi-idri*, etc., in which the second element is clearly the same as that of the name ^{ilu}IM-*idri*. This element corresponds exactly to the second element of the well-known Old Testament name, Hadadezer, namely, עזר. The Aramaic form is, of course, עדר (or עזר). Dr. Langdon assumes that the Aramaic element corresponding to *idri* is *hader* (הדר). It would be interesting to know of other names besides the hypothetical *Pir-hader* containing this element. I know of none. On the other hand, on turning to the Hebrew lexicon we find such names as עֲזַרְיָה, עֲזַרְיאֵל (= Azriyau of the cuneiform), and others, compounded with the element עזר. It is true this element precedes the name of the deity in these examples, but that is immaterial. Turning to S. A. Cook's *Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*, we find a number of names compounded with the same element עזר or עדר: אמעזר, p. 21; בעלעזר, p. 32; הרעדר, p. 44;[1] קוסעדר, p. 104; and שמשעדרי, p. 116.[2]

In a word, if we should read the first element of ^{ilu}IM-*idri* as *Pir*, this name would necessarily appear in Aramaic as פר־עדר, in which case it would have just *one* letter in common with the Hebrew בן־הדד, of which it is, according to the hypothesis of Dr. Langdon, the equivalent. It will be seen why I cannot accept such an identification, and why I still believe that the name ^{ilu}IM-*idri* of Shalmaneser's inscriptions must be read *Adad-idri*, that is, *Hadadezer*.

Let me quote from page 281 of my article.

'From the side of the Old Testament narrative, the writer sees only one objection that can be raised against this identification, namely, 2 K 8$^{7ff.}$. According to this account Hazael, after putting *Benhadad* out of the way, usurped the throne of Syria. Now, it is obviously impossible to put a third Benhadad between Adad-idri and Hazael, for, according to the inscriptions of Shalmaneser, this king's last campaign against Adad-idri is dated in his fourteenth year (846), while his next campaign against Syria was in his eighteenth year (842), and this time *Hazael* was king of Damascus, while Jehu of Israel paid tribute to Assyria. We must assume, therefore, that the writer of the Elisha stories made a mistake.' That is, in having Hazael usurp the throne of *Benhadad*, after murdering him.

[1] 'Horus helped,' or 'Horus is the helper.' Cook's note on this name reads: 'Notice the ר instead of ז (the inscription is on a cylinder from Assyria belonging to the eighth to seventh century).'

[2] Compare with these the names found in the Elephantinê Papyri dating from the fifth century B.C., בעלעזר, נשכעדרי, Nusku-idri, and עדרי, probably an abbreviated form of a similar name. Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka*, Leipzig, 1911, index of proper names.

Dr. Langdon believes that the new inscription of Shalmaneser which he has translated confirms the historicity of 2 K $8^{7ff.}$. But does it not do the very opposite?

According to the Old Testament record, Benhadad of Syria falls ill, and sends Hazael to inquire of Elisha, who has just reached Damascus, whether there is any hope for his recovery. Elisha tells Hazael to inform his master that he shall surely recover: 'Howbeit Jehovah hath showed me that he shall surely die.' In the subsequent conversation, Hazael is informed by Elisha that he is to be king over Syria. On the strength of this Hazael returns to his master, delivers the answer of Elisha, and proceeds to smother him with a wet coverlet, whereupon he 'reigned in his stead.'

According to Dr. Langdon's translation of the new text, 'it is expressly stated that Hazael, the son of a nobody, seized the throne of *ilu IM-idri*, and that the latter fled from the country.' What becomes of the historicity of the Old Testament account *if* Dr. Langdon's translation is correct?

Now I frankly confess that I was not disappointed when I saw that Dr. Langdon's translation so far from confirming, actually cast doubt upon the historicity of 2 K $8^{7ff.}$, for I do not see how anybody can seriously hope that the miserable account of Hazael's usurpation is true. But on looking at the Assyrian text I at once saw that Dr. Langdon's translation was faulty at the vital point. *The text does not say that ilu IM-idri fled from his country.*

The passage which Dr. Langdon has translated 'abandoned his land' (line 25), must be read in the Assyrian, *šadâšu emid*, not *mâtašu emid*. The expression *KUR-šu emid* has always been a puzzle to scholars, although the context in all of the passages in which it occurs points to the meaning 'he died.' This has been recognized by scholars, as may be seen by consulting the Lexicon of Muss-Arnolt. But how 'he stood on his land,' which is the literal translation of *mâtašu emid*, could mean 'he died' remained inexplicable until a few years ago, when Winckler found the expression on one of the tablets he had excavated at Boghaz-Keui. Here the writing *HAR-SAG i-mi-id* takes the place of the usual *KUR*(-*šu*) *emid*. The ideogram *KUR* may stand for *mâtu* = land or *šadû* = mountain. But the ideogram *HAR-SAG* is not so ambiguous; it is equivalent to *šadû* only, and the phrase *KUR-šu emid* is therefore to be read as *šadâ-šu emid*, and translated 'he stood on his mountain,' meaning he reached his zenith = he died. So Winckler. It is true that it is difficult to see how the meaning 'he died' follows from 'he stood on his mountain,' but the context in the tablet from which Winckler quotes[1] raises this translation of the phrase beyond a reasonable doubt. The Hittite king Hattusil gives a sort of chronicle of events from the time of his grandfather Subbiluliuma to his own day. 'In the time of Subbiluliuma, my grandfather, Azira, king (of Amurru . . .) revolted (?) to Egypt, but later (cast himself) at the feet of my grandfather Subbiluliuma. My grandfather pardoned him,' etc. The next paragraph reads: 'When Subbiluliuma, my grandfather, had died (*šadâ* [*HAR-SAG*] *imid*), Mursili, my father, the son of Subbiluliuma, ascended the throne,' etc.

We must therefore read the passage in the text of Shalmaneser, '*ilu IM-idri* (*Hadadezer*) died (*šadâ-šu emid*) and Hazael the son of a nobody seized the throne,' and there remains the *possibility* that the Syrian king died after the manner of the Old Testament narrative. 'And it came to pass on the morrow, that he took the coverlet, and dipped it in water, and spread it on his face, so that he died: and Hazael reigned in his stead.'

D. D. Luckenbill.

University of Chicago.

The First Prayer in the Bible.

Referring to Dr. Nestle's interesting contribution to The Expository Times, February 1912, p. 258, may I ask if we do not find the first prayer in the Bible in Abraham's pathetic pleading for Ishmael, Gn 17^{18}, 'O that Ishmael might live before thee!'? A prayer this that had its answer without delay, v.[20], and which, with the name in it of some dear child for whom he desired the life that is life indeed, has gone up from many a father's heart since then.

Robert G. Forrest.

West Coates, Edinburgh.

[1] Winckler published a preliminary study of the tablets found at Boghaz-Keui in the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 35, December 1907. The passage in question is on p. 43.

Unbiblical Beliefs on Biblical Matters.

To the examples already given by Professor Nestle and others should be added the almost universally prevalent view that the woman who was a 'sinner' (Lk 7^{36-50}) was Mary Magdalene. This mistake is, of course, a serious one, but there is no more justification for it than for the others already mentioned. It is also a mistake that one almost despairs of overtaking and killing. The fair fame of Magdalene seems indelibly besmirched. No wrong has ever been more gratuitous.

F. Warburton Lewis.

Aberystwyth.

Alpha and Omega.

Dr. Nestle (see January issue) is surely right in dismissing Dr. Oesterley's conjectural explanation of the constant reading τὸ Ὦ in the expression τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὦ. If, as the latter suggests, Ἄλφα is merely due to confusion with *Aleph* in a Hebrew original, and Ὦ to confusion with *Tau*, through similarity in form (especially as written in first-century script), all one can say is that it was very singular and very fortunate that Ω should happen to be the *last* letter in the Greek alphabet. How awkward it would have been had the Greek character so easily confused with *Tau* ranked somewhere between the first and the last!

As to Nestle's own simple explanation, namely, that at the time when the Apocalypse was written 'the name O mega was not yet in use, still less as one word Omega,' I share his desire to know the exact time when the distinctive terms Omega and Omicron were brought into use. Hort, in his note on Apoc 1^{8}, contents himself with saying '"Omega" is a comparatively modern name.' Yes, but how modern? The character Ω, as distinct from O, was adopted at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. According to Liddell and Scott, the *name* of the character O was anciently given as οὖ, leaving apparently ō as the *name* of Ω or ω. When did this give place to the established use of the distinctive names, Omega and Omicron? And as to these forms themselves, strictly speaking, the former more correctly = ὁ μέγα rather than ὦ μέγα, in contradistinction to the latter. Murray (*s.v.* Omega) has an interesting quotation from a sixteenth-century author who curiously gives the two names as ωμικρον and ωμεγα, probably in a purely phonetic way.

Whilst there is no trace of a Greek text reading τὸ Ἄλφα καὶ τὸ Ὦ μέγα, the TR, of course, reads τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, and it is supported in this by Cod. B. in Apoc 22^{13}. Cf. the Vulgate, 'ego sum α et ω.' The quotation Dr. Nestle gives in his *P.S.* is noteworthy: but the form 'alpha et o' appears to have been very familiar and in common use in pre-Reformation times. In an oft-quoted stanza of one of the hymns of Prudentius (fourth century) we have

> Corde natus ex Parentis
> Ante mundi exordium,
> Alpha et Ω cognominatus. . . .

But we find it appearing much later also. Thus in a delightful old German carol (fourteenth century) the first stanza (*E.T.*) runs:

> *In dulci jubilo*!
> Let us our homage shew;
> Our heart's joy reclineth
> *In praesepio*,
> And like a bright star shineth
> *Matris in gremio*;
> *Alpha es et O*!

Murray (*s.l.* O) quotes from the *Towneley Mysteries* (fifteenth century): 'Ego sum alpha et o, I am the first, the last also.' Neither in Prudentius nor in these other instances does the use of O appear to be determined merely by exigencies of metre or rhyme. Witness further the interesting form occurring in the Wicliffite N.T. (fourteenth century): 'Y am alpha and oo.'

The rendering of our E.VV., 'I am Alpha and Omega,' is exemplified in Tindale's N.T. (1526). Note also Beza's Latin N.T.: 'Ego sum Alpha et Omega.' On the other hand we have the German, 'Ich bin das A und das O.' Were the scholars of the Reformation the very first to use Omega in N.T. along with the name Alpha given in full?

J. S. Clemens.

Ranmoor College, Sheffield.

Entre Nous.

A Summer School of Theology.

A Summer School of Theology for men and women will be held at Oxford from July 22nd to August 2nd, embracing about fifty Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, Old and New Testament, Church History and Comparative Religion. The Lectures will be given in the Hall of Trinity College, by the kind permission of the President and Fellows. Among the Lecturers will be Professors G. A. Cooke, Percy Gardner, J. A. Smith, W. R. Sorley, G. Milligan, J. H. Moulton, K. Lake (Leiden), N. Söderblom (Upsala), B. W. Bacon (Yale), the Principals of Mansfield and Manchester Colleges, Rev. W. E. Addis, Dr. Vernon Bartlet, Professor W. H. Bennett, Dr. A. J. Carlyle, Rev. R. T. Herford, Mr. R. R. Marett, Dr. James Moffatt, Dr. J. E. Odgers, Professor John Oman, Rev. P. H. Wicksteed.

New Poems.

The volumes of poetry which the month produces usually come with the month and go with it. But sometimes they stay. This month we have seven small volumes, all worth reading. We have read them through, and two of them at least will stay with us.

Of the volume by 'Una,' the title is *In Life's Garden* (Humphreys; 3s. 6d. net). Life is a garden. And 'a garden is a lovesome thing, God wot,' as T. E. B. has told us in a way we shall never forget. But in a lovesome thing like a garden all life's experiences may be imaginatively gone through. There may, for example, be this lost opportunity:

Just on the Borders of Enchanted Land
We linger,—culling here and there some bloom;
From distant gardens sweet and rare perfume
The soft breeze gently wafteth where we stand.
We might have enter'd—you and I, dear Heart!
Lo, the dusk falleth—and 'tis time to part.

The next is *Forty-two Poems*, by James Elroy Flecker (Dent; 2s. 6d. net). Most of the poems have already appeared elsewhere, and many of them we have previously read where they have appeared, as in the *Nation* and the *Cambridge Review*. There is no frivolous poetry in the book. There is always purpose and seriousness even when the form is light. The endless theme of love is sometimes touched to tragedy, as in—

THE BALLAD OF CAMDEN TOWN.

I walked with Maisie long years back
The streets of Camden Town,
I splendid in my suit of black,
And she divine in brown.

Hers was a proud and noble face,
A secret heart, and eyes
Like water in a lonely place
Beneath unclouded skies.

A bed, a chest, a faded mat,
And broken chairs a few,
Were all we had to grace our flat
In Hazel Avenue.

But I could walk to Hampstead Heath,
And crown her head with daisies,
And watch the streaming world beneath,
And men with other Maisies.

When I was ill and she was pale
And empty stood our store,
She left the latchkey on its nail,
And saw me nevermore.

Perhaps she cast herself away
Lest both of us should drown:
Perhaps she feared to die, as they
Who die in Camden Town.

What came of her? The bitter nights
Destroy the rose and lily,
And souls are lost among the lights
Of painted Piccadilly.

What came of her? The river flows
So deep and wide and stilly,
And waits to catch the fallen rose
And clasp the broken lily.

I dream she dwells in London still
And breathes the evening air,
And often walk to Primrose Hill,
And hope to meet her there.

Once more together we will live,
For I will find her yet:
I have so little to forgive;
So much, I can't forget.

In *Ballads and Verses of the Spiritual Life*, by E. Nesbit (Elkin Mathews; 4s. 6d. net), there is one poem that is worth the rest of the poetry of the month put together. There are other poems in the book. For this writer wrestles successfully with the supreme difficulty of the sacred in poetry. But the poem on 'The Singing of the Magnificat' has most of the inevitable in it. It impresses us most with the feeling that this is the way to express the thought, and there is no other. The poem is far too long to quote, but these three verses may be taken out of it:

The white moon through the window seemed to gaze
On the pure face and eyes the singer raised;
The storm-wind hushed the clamour of its ways,
God seemed to stoop to hear Himself thus praised,
And breathless all the Brothers stood, and still
Reached longing souls out to the music's thrill.

Old years came back, and half-forgotten hours,
Dreams of delight that never was to be,
Mothers' remembered kiss, the funeral flowers
Laid on the grave of life's felicity;
An infinite dear passion of regret
Swept through their hearts, and left their eyelids wet.

The birds beat ever at the window, till
They broke the pane, and so could entrance win;
Their slender feet clung to the window-sill,
And though with them the bitter air came in,
The monks were glad that the birds too should hear,
Since to God's creatures all, His praise is dear.

Mr. Hugh Macnaghten, Assistant Master at Eton College, has published a volume of *Verses Ancient and Modern* (Allen; 3s. net). The note of the volume is loyalty—loyalty to Eton, and loyalty to the Empire. And once or twice, it must be confessed, the poems are more patriotic than poetical. There is an occasional translation, as this epitaph from Simonides on the Spartans who died at Thermopylæ:

Tell it in Lacedæmon, we are laid,
Wayfarer, here: they spoke and we obeyed.

With it we may compare Mr. Macnaghten's own epitaph on the Etonians who died in South Africa:

Possessing all good things, at duty's call
We died for England; that was best of all.

The form of dialogue occurs once or twice, and is effective. Take this on

THE CHILD AND JOY.

I know thee, Joy.
I would be known to every girl and boy.
I love thee best.
Thou too art dear, but not beyond the rest.
Stay with me still.
I cannot choose, I serve another's will.

Mr. Percy L. Babbington sings because he must. His volume of *Poems* (Heffer; 2s. 6d. net) is inspired by any subject that happens to come his way. On the same page we have a long-lined poem about a deserted home, and a little tripping song which begins:

Though leagues of sea dissever
Thy lips from mine,
Fond Memory's magic ever
Keeps my love thine.

The translations prove that Mr. Babbington is a scholar as well as a poet.

We said two of the volumes would live. One of the two is, of course, *Poems and Translations*, by John M. Synge (Maunsel; 3s. 6d. net). It is the first volume of a new edition of Synge's works, a uniform library edition in five volumes. In size it is a large crown octavo, and it is finely printed, as the publishers explain to us, on antique wove paper, and tastefully bound in cloth gilt, gilt top. To criticize the contents of the volume is now needless. Synge has taken his place among the immortals. We no longer give him 'Mr.' or

Christian surname. But we must not be denied our right of quotation. Take this on

DREAD.

Beside a chapel I'd a room looked down,
Where all the women from the farms and town,
On Holy-days and Sundays used to pass
To marriages, and christenings, and to Mass.

Then I sat lonely watching score and score,
Till I turned jealous of the Lord next door. . . .
Now by this window, where there's none can see,
The Lord God's jealous of yourself and me.

One of the poets is American. Some of the poems in the volume entitled *Men of No Land*, by Mildred McNeal-Sweeney (Fisher Unwin; 4s. 6d. net), have already appeared in the great American magazines. But the poems themselves are not predominantly American. The first, which gives its title to the book, was written by the author after she witnessed the procession of wives and children of the unemployed in London on the 6th of November, 1905. The men of no land are the husbands of these wives. There is an anxious feeling for assurance in religion in many of the poems, and sometimes the catching at a straw. Such a straw is the sudden vision of blue skies past the dull roofs:

Low roofs and sordid,
And the same poor street
Climbing still
The well-known, weary hill!
But oh, the radiant grey,
The lovely, indescribable flush of day
Where hill and morning meet!

The same little beauty,
And labour trudging by,
And the vain
Truckle to common gain:
But hour by hour,
Lovely with light—like a forgotten dower,
Past the dull roofs—the sky.

Colour of hope,
Colour of June and the rose,
Cool with the dew
Or great with storm—spread new
Hourly with promises
Of good days coming—for the lonely heart it is
The book of unfailing joy that never shall close.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Walter T. Scott, Colfax, Wisconsin.

Illustrations for the Great Text for April must be received by the 1st of March. The text is Is 30^{15}.

The Great Text for May is Is 40^{6-8}—'The voice of one saying, Cry. And one said, What shall I cry? All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our Lord shall stand for ever.' A copy of Hutton's *A Disciple's Religion*, or Oswald Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for June is Is $53^{1.\ 2}$—'Who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.' A copy of Agnew's *Life's Christ Places*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for July is Ro $1^{3.\ 4}$—'Concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of MacCulloch's *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, or of Curtis's *A History of Creeds and Confessions*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for August is 2 Ch 25^{2}—'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart'; along with 2 Ch 31^{21}—'He did it with all his heart, and prospered.' A copy of Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In *The Interpreter* for January there is an address which Professor Gwatkin delivered at the Vacation Term for Biblical Study in Cambridge. Its title is 'Christ and Life.' If it had not been called an address, we should have been tempted to think that it was a sermon, and that the text was, 'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly' (Jn 10^{10}).

But Professor Gwatkin has a larger purpose than the exposition of a text. He has come to the conclusion that all that God has to give us is covered by the one word 'Life.' That word, therefore, and what it means, should occupy our attention—not the Incarnation and Atonement, which is the means used by God for bestowing it; not Faith, which is the hand held out to receive it; and not Love, which is its outcome. Life is the greatest thing.

Now Life comes from God, not directly from the Father, but mediately from the Son. 'As the Father has life in himself, so has he given to the Son to have life in himself, that he should give eternal life to as many as God has given him.' We are accordingly driven along two lines of research. First, What is this Life which is the supreme gift? Next, Who is this Son of God who gives it?

The easier of these two questions is the second, and Professor Gwatkin begins with it. Who is Christ?

It is a very easy question 'if I speak to Christians here.' For 'we know in whom we have trusted.' We have trusted in one who claimed to be the Son of God, and spoke of God as His Father in a quite peculiar sense; who, in short, made a claim to be in the fullest sense divine. This claim runs through all the records of His life. And if we are satisfied that it is not a fraud —take time with these words—a fraud, or a delusion, or a legend (if, says Professor Gwatkin, it *can* be a legend), then we can do no less than confess in Him the eternal Son of God to whom the Father has given power over all flesh that He may give eternal life to all whom God has given Him. The first question, 'if I speak to Christians,' is easy. The second is not so easy.

The second question is, What is Life? Professor Gwatkin cannot answer it. We know the signs of life, but we do not know what life is in itself. Why do we not know? Because we cannot get behind it. We cannot view it from the outside. Still, we can say that some signs are nearer than others to the secret of it. We cannot say what that life is which reaches from the obscurest motions of the lowest plants and animals, through the rich variety of Creation, upward to ourselves,

and above us even to the living and true God. But we can say that there are three great spheres of its manifestation. There is the animal life, the life which only sees and hears, eats and drinks. There is the social life, the life of man with man. And there is the spiritual life, the life of fellowship with God.

These three forms of life we may consider separately. And yet they are not altogether separable. 'Before all things,' says Professor GWATKIN, 'let us beware of narrow and unworthy conceptions of life. That which God hath joined, let not man put asunder. The animal life, the social life, and the spiritual life form one organic whole; and though we can have the lower without the higher, we cannot have the higher without the lower. The social life is unsound if the animal life is stunted in the slums or the monasteries, and the life to God is maimed if either the social life or the animal life is counted profane. No doubt it is better to enter into life with one eye than to be cast into outer darkness; but it is better still to enter having two eyes. As the plant feeds on things without life, so the animal feeds ultimately on plant life, the social life feeds on the animal life, and the life to God feeds on the social life.'

And the three great spheres of life are inseparable not only because the one below passes always into the one above it, but also because the higher keeps continually returning to bless the lower. The social life restrains the animal life from indiscreetness or excess. The spiritual life sanctifies the social life and the animal life.

The spiritual life, says Professor GWATKIN, sanctifies the social and the animal life. It makes them holy. We speak of Nature and Society, spelling the words with capital letters, as if they had an independent existence. We say that we owe a duty to Society. But our social life is not a godless environment. It is not simply our appointed field of duty. 'The love which sustains it is itself the outflow and the revelation of the love of God, and a revelation which rises highest precisely where it is most deeply rooted in the instincts of the animal life.'

Now when he has given us some idea of what life is, Professor GWATKIN returns to Christ. For Christ is after all the end of his effort. And he begins with Christ as the giver of life. 'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.'

Arrest that word 'abundantly.' It is not spiritual life only that He came to give. It is not on 'the religious' only that He pours the love which flows from His life. He came that we might have life in all its range. 'He was not like some who have even boasted that they care for nothing but immortal souls.' In a far deeper sense than Roman ever dreamed, nothing that is human can be foreign to the incarnate Lord. He fed the multitude, and did not forget to command that something be given to the child to eat. To the sick, and even to the dead, He restored the bounding joy of life. But it was never a formal gift. It was the natural outflow of His own loving spirit of life.

And just as He restored the animal life or increased its fulness, so He entered the social sphere and added to its joy—till they dared to call Him a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber. In loving sympathy His soul went forth to meet the father's distress, the widow's grief, the sister's sorrow, and in meeting transfigured them with joy of heaven. His gift was always a gift of life—the loving outflow of life in Himself, the occasion of love in them.

And just as it was with animal and social life, so was it with spiritual life. For here also there was a sickness unto death, even death itself, for 'she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth,' and He came to give life eternal and to give even it abundantly. This, at least, the disciples did not misunderstand. They were marvellously dull of hearing, but one thing they held to: 'Thou

hast the words of eternal life.' They could not have said unhesitatingly how this conviction had come to them. But it is evident even to us that it had not come from His teaching alone, though they spoke of His 'words.' It came from Himself, as all that was best and most enduring came to them.

Who, then, is this? Who is this that gives life to all that lives, and gives it in the bounding joy of abundance? Who is this that comes to give life to the dead, and gives it—animal life to the body, social life to the community, spiritual life to the soul?

Now we have already noticed that the original source of life is the Father. From Him the Son receives it. 'As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.' But the gift is timeless. You cannot say that at such a time in the eternity of the past the Father had life and the Son had it not. For life is itself the result of love, and love is the outflow and expression of the Divine nature. As soon as the Father has life in Himself, He loves, and that love is the bearer of life to the Son. From which it follows—watch its reasonableness and check its logic—from which it follows, says Professor GWATKIN, that there is a community of nature between the Persons of the Deity, that the Persons of the Trinity are therefore not such individuals as we seem ourselves to be, and that, last of all, 'if the Trinity is a mystery, it is at least true to reason, which Unitarianism and Tritheism are not.'

We have mounted up to the Triune God. Let us come down again to the things of earth. And let us notice this first, that whatever God's purpose for the earth may be, He will carry that purpose out. Has He not the will to do this? Has He not the power? Then He is not God. The obstacle is sin. Well, sin must 'in one way or another and in the end' be removed.

And we even see how it is to be removed. 'God so loved the world.' Of course He did. For life outflows in love. And then? Then love always issues in life. 'I came that they may have life,' which is just as if He had said, 'I came to love them.' Love issues in life. In proportion as God loves the world, the world will have life. Now He loves the world even to the death of His only-begotten Son. Therefore the world will have life in abundance.

The reasoning is the reasoning of Professor GWATKIN. Is there a fallacy in it? The only fallacy that ever can enter into such reasoning is faithlessness. 'Believe ye that I am able to do this?' 'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst.' And He answers, 'I can, I will, be thou filled with life abundantly.'

The only fallacy, we say, is faithlessness. But we must have something to put our faith in. We cannot put our faith in the power of God, or in the will of God, or in God's power and will combined, as long as God is outside of us. The love that issues in life must come into touch with us. The Father could not have given to the Son to have life if He had been less than a Son. And the Son cannot give life to the men that are in the world until He becomes Himself a man.

So the confession of Christ's *deity*, in the fullest Athanasian sense, says Professor GWATKIN, is not enough. He does not think it is quite fair to the unbeliever to assert the deity of Christ, and say He is the Saviour of men because He is the Son of God. And he does not think it is wise for our own sake.

It is not fair to the unbeliever. For when the unbeliever asks how a man, any man, can have the universal and eternal value which we attribute to Christ, it is not enough, it is not even quite fair, to answer, Because He was also the Son of God. He is then entitled to ask whether it was the Son of God or the man Christ Jesus who brought us life abundantly. And if now we say

it was the Son of God, we are simply calling in the power of His deity to help when we think His humanity insufficient. And that, says Professor GWATKIN, is to offer Him the twelve legions of angels which He would not ask, or even to make Him accept the worship of Satan which He rejected.

On the other hand, we cannot say that our salvation is the work of a man, of any man however exalted, separate and, as they say, 'unique.' What *is* our answer to the unbeliever? It is that Jesus, while a common son of man like other men, was also the Son of man, more nearly related to all men than they are to one another. And this, says Professor GWATKIN, is also the teaching of the Gospel.

And so, it is not wise for our own sake to say that the life we are offered is offered by the Son of God. That it is not offered by an ordinary or even the most extraordinary man who is still no more than one of ourselves, we know. It is wise, and it is the only wisdom, to say that He who, because He was the Creator, must from the beginning have had something human in Him, became man, taking upon Him the nature of man, that as man He might, through the love that sent Him to the cross, release the life that was in Him, and make it ours.

Almost at the same time as the Cambridge University Press has issued a new and scholarly edition of *George Fox's Journal*, Messrs. Macmillan have published the first volume of a 'History of the Society of Friends.' It is the first volume in this respect that its title is *The Beginnings of Quakerism*. But it is part of a great scheme which was conceived by the late John Wilhelm ROWNTREE. That scheme was to write the whole history of Quakerism fully, and not for Quakers only, but for all men, not with apologetic interest, but 'abreast of the requirements of modern research,' and thus to make it known 'as a great experiment in spiritual religion.'

Mr. ROWNTREE delivered some lectures on the rise of Quakerism in Yorkshire, which were issued in his volume of *Essays and Addresses*, and then he died. But the scheme did not die with him. First Dr. Rufus M. JONES published two volumes entitled *Studies in Mystical Religion* and *The Quakers in the American Colonies*. And now Mr. W. C. BRAITHWAITE, B.A., LL.B., President of the Woodbrooke Settlement, near Birmingham, has gone back to the beginning and written the History of Quakerism from its first small beginnings in the year 1647 to the end of the year 1660.

Mr. BRAITHWAITE has been chosen for this work. We do not mean by a committee of Quakers, but by God. The execution of the work makes that manifest. It is not Mr. BRAITHWAITE'S own work, however, that we propose to speak about. To this volume an Introduction has been contributed by Professor Rufus M. JONES. It is an Introduction that is intended not to introduce the volume to our notice, but to introduce to our notice Quakerism 'as a great experiment in spiritual religion.' Quakerism, Dr. JONES seems to admit, is not Christianity solely and wholly, but it is 'a type of Christianity.' And as a type of Christianity it is, he says, deeply *mystical* and also deeply *prophetical*.

It is deeply mystical. But what is Mysticism? Mysticism, says Dr. JONES, 'is a type of religion as rich and many-sided as life itself—it is, in fact, life itself at its highest inward unity and its most consummate attainment of Reality.' The definition is worth remembering. It is worth remembering on account of the high claim it makes for Mysticism. For if Mysticism is all this, there seems to be little left for any other type of religion. Dr. JONES is convinced that Mysticism is all this.

The mistake, he says, which writers about Mysticism make is to treat it as if it were but one among many theoretical systems of religious thought, to reduce it to a metaphysic, and to

leave the impression on the mind of the reader that it is either the *negative path* which the intellect takes to find God, or an equally empty ecstasy in which the intellect is utterly quiescent. But true mysticism is neither passive, nor negative, nor theoretical. It is a type of religion 'in which all the deep-lying powers of the personal life come into positive exercise and function, so that there results an experience, not merely emotional, not merely intellectual, not merely volitional, through which the soul finds itself in a love-relation with the Living God.'

The term 'mystical,' then, is properly used for any type of religion which insists upon 'an immediate inward revelation of God within the sphere of personal experience.' The person who has this experience, who, in Dr. JONES' language, 'has found within the deeps of himself the bubbling streams from the Eternal Fountain of Life,' has no more use for sacred Book or historic Church. To use the words of Professor JONES again, he 'no longer feels compelled to go back to the pools of tradition or the stagnant wells of authority for his supplies.' He may maintain perfectly normal relations with things visible, or he may have ecstasies—that will depend upon his own psychical constitution—but whether his life is normal or abnormal in outward manifestation, his experience of God is immediate and sufficient.

Well, the Quakers are mystics. 'It was through experiences of this first-hand type that the Quaker movement was initiated, and all the primitive leaders of it—"the First Publishers of Truth," as they were called—were recipients of experiences which convinced them that God revealed Himself directly, and immediately within themselves.' What does Fox say? 'When all my hopes in men,' he says, 'were gone, so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell what to do, then, O then, I heard a voice which said, There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition; and when I heard it my heart did leap for joy. *I knew experimentally* that Jesus Christ enlightens, gives grace, and faith, and power. *I now knew God by revelation*, as He who hath the key did open.'

That is the first thing. Quakerism is a mystical religion. The other thing is that Quakerism is a prophetical religion. That is to say, the early Quakers believed that the Spirit of God was poured out upon them, as it had been of old; that they were called to be prophets to their age, and that the language of Old and New Testament prophecy and apocalypse was actually fulfilled in their experiences.

Did they foretell the future? Professor JONES declines to answer. He does not think the question is worth answering. For prophecy in its true meaning has nothing to do with 'magical foretelling.' The prophets were conscious that they were selected by God to speak *for* Him, and utter His will and purpose to their age. And with this conviction the public ministry and the biographies of the early Quakers are saturated. 'Their testimonies,' says Dr. JONES, 'are breathlessly daring; but there can, I think, be little doubt that they sincerely believed that they had a right to apply the most exalted Scripture language to their own inward events.' And he is in as little doubt that this prophetical and apocalyptic element vastly helped to produce the mental and emotional atmosphere of the movement, and added much to its fervour and conquering power.

Mr. Claude C. MONTEFIORE is a man of a most provoking personality. In some he induces no other feeling than untempered dislike; in others no other emotion than unmixed admiration. But no one who comes in contact with him, even in his books, can be indifferent. His latest book is an apparently inoffensive handbook of instruction for the use of parents and teachers, entitled *Outlines of Liberal Judaism* (Macmillan; 2s. 6d. net). It will be the occasion of a new outburst of adoration and ill-will.

Mr. Montefiore is the exponent of Liberal Judaism. He is commonly called its founder. But that is an English and very insular mistake, which Mr. Montefiore himself has denied till he is weary. He is not its founder. But he is *the* exponent of it. There is no other man who seems to have the same sense of responsibility for propagating this faith. There is assuredly no man who has a more triumphant command of the English language.

What is Liberal Judaism? It is criticism of the Old Testament and appreciation of the New. Now it is bitter enough to Conservative Jews to be told that the Law did not come by Moses; it is more bitter, even altogether intolerable, to be told that Jewish children should be allowed to read the New Testament as well as the Old.

Is Liberal Judaism simply Liberal Christianity, then? Is Mr. Montefiore a follower of Christ? By no means. He tells us that one of his friends has recently spoken of him as the most Jewish Jew in the world. But Mr. Montefiore and Liberal Judaism will not live in vain. They have lowered, if they have not taken away, that middle wall of partition which separates Jew and Christian from one another, first by simply getting Jews to look at the difference between them, and then especially by getting them to look at Jesus.

In this very book Mr. Montefiore once more invites his brethren to examine the differences between Judaism and Christianity. We also may do well to examine them.

But first of all Mr. Montefiore touches on their agreements. Christianity sprang out of Judaism. 'Not only were its founder and its earliest apostles Jews, but it has retained much of the religion out of which it sprang.' Both religions are monotheistic, 'though each regards its own monotheism as purer, better, and truer than the monotheism of the other.' Both hold that the one and only God is good and righteous and loving; both hold that He has relations with man; both hold that He *cares*. Both Jews and Christians hold that man was created in the divine image, that God influences man and 'inspires' him. Both can speak of the holy and divine Spirit within the soul of man. Both believe that man can commune with God. Both believe in prayer.

Nor is that all. The Old Testament is the Bible of the Jew; it is also a dearly loved and well-read part of the Bible of the Christian. 'Christian admiration for the religious and moral ideals of the prophets, for the spiritual fervour and beauty of the Psalter, is not less than Jewish admiration (and sometimes rests, to our shame, may I add, upon a more intimate and familiar knowledge).' Moreover—and Mr. Montefiore presses this matter, though he knows it is unacceptable—Jews have been and are being greatly influenced by Christian ideals and a Christian atmosphere.

But there are differences. And first, Christians believe in Incarnation, Jews do not. The dogma of the Incarnation has taken many forms, says Mr. Montefiore, and has been interpreted in different ways. He does not suppose that the interpretation of it by a Liberal Christian to-day is the interpretation of it by even the greatest minds of the fourth and the fifth century. But he says, and he says it 'with assurance and authority,' that to no existing form of the dogma of the Incarnation can Judaism—whether Orthodox or Liberal—be anything but opposed.

Why? Mr. Montefiore proceeds to tell us why. It is not because Judaism puts God on one side and man on the other, with no bridge between them. It is because man is imperfect, and God is perfect. It is because man is finite and errs, while God is infinite and faultless. It is because 'there never has been, and there never can be, a man who was perfectly good and perfectly wise.'

So the objection is, after all, not to the Incarnation; it is to the sinless perfection of Jesus.

The next difference is that Jews do not believe in atonement and mediation. The Jew does not need a mediator. God is very near. Mr. MONTEFIORE quotes (they are the words of a Christian!):

Speak to Him thou for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet;
Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet.

And he does not need atonement. The only atonement he needs is the atonement 'wrought by human repentance and the divine forgiveness,' or, as he otherwise puts it, 'by God's grace and help upon the one hand, by human remorse and effort upon the other.'

Is that all? Is there not yet another difference? Does not the Jew believe in justification by works, the Christian in justification by faith? No. Mr. MONTEFIORE gives up that difference. He doubts if the Christian has done justice to works; he is quite sure that the Jew has not done justice to faith. He is well aware that a Christian writer said, 'Faith without works is dead.' He himself sees that a man's faith is 'the core of his character.' And he says frankly, 'We need both faith and works.' 'I cannot help believing that this old point of difference between Judaism and Christianity may gradually be done away with. Each will recognize that the fuller truth lies in a combination of doctrines hitherto thought opposed and alien to each other.'

Some Thoughts suggested by the Comparative Study of Religion.[1]

BY THE REV. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., ABERDEEN.

THE present paper is by one who makes no claim to speak as an expert on either the History or the Science of Religions; it makes no attempt to construct a Philosophy of Religion or any theory of its evolution. All I propose is simply to record the impressions that have been made on my mind by the contact into which I have had to come, on paper, if not in the flesh, with religions of all kinds, from the lowest and simplest to the highest and most complex. The thoughts I am to set before you are not the outcome of systematic study of classified religions, as one may study groups of animals or of plants or minerals in a museum; nor do they represent a theory formed beforehand and applied to the various religions that have come under my view; they are the product slowly, almost unconsciously, evolved from the constantly changing kaleidoscopic process that unfolds itself every day to the eyes of one who has to read and to examine carefully the articles contributed to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* now in course of publication, under the editorship of Dr. Hastings.

I. The first great fact that grows increasingly clear to me daily is that *man is a religious being*. The old question whether there are tribes of atheists has nowadays become a merely 'academic discussion.' For my own part I do not believe that any sufficient evidence has yet been adduced to prove that any people on earth has been discovered that is wholly destitute of religion, using that term in the wide sense of belief in the existence of some power or powers mightier than man himself, whose favour it is desired to gain, whose wrath it is sought to deprecate. All the great authorities—men like Max Müller, Jevons, Tiele, Tylor, Waitz, and Gerland—are at one on this point. Supposed examples to the contrary effect have been abandoned, in view of fuller information. Thus, Howitt came to abandon the view he once held as to the aborigines of Australia being without

[1] Abridged from an address delivered to the Theological Society of the Aberdeen United Free Church College, on 17th November 1911.

any religion; and the same thing has happened in the case of the natives of Vancouver and of some parts of Western Africa. It needs long residence among, and a complete gaining of the confidence of, primitive peoples to discover their secret beliefs. Even Buddhism, although it rejected the traditional gods of India, made that rejection in the interests of a truly religious spirit. Its aim was to satisfy a religious craving, the craving for redemption. And even the branding of individuals as atheists is not always justified. Both Xenophanes and Socrates were falsely so charged. Lucretius is often cited as an example of one whose creed was blank atheism, but he was not really an irreligious man. What he protested against, in the name of piety, was a religion of terror, which was also often the parent of crimes; he raised his voice against gods who had to be propitiated by bloody sacrifices.

> Nec pietas ullast velatum saepe videri,
> Vertier ad lapidem atque omnis accedere ad aras,
> Nec procumbere humi prostratum et pandere palmas
> Ante deum delubra, nec aras sanguine multo
> Spargere quadrupedum, nec votis nectere vota,
> Sed mage pacata posse omnia mente tueri.[1]

Besides, atheism has never been a lasting phenomenon. Sooner or later it provokes a reaction. Again, tribes that recognize few if any personal gods have a belief in a mysterious power or essence, which is now generally designated by the Polynesian word *mana*, and here we have certainly the elements of a religious conception.

The phenomena disclosed by the comparative study of religions, varied as they are, witness to the existence of a craving that is universally felt, a craving that cannot find satisfaction within oneself, or in the material world, but, however vaguely it may be realized, in the unseen. And so the words which Augustine wrote long ago are justified: 'Thou hast created us for Thyself; and our heart is ill at ease until it finds its rest in Thee.' Granting the existence of this universal craving, there must, unless all teleology be a fraud and a delusion, be some provision arranged to meet it. Food and drink are the natural provision for the universal cravings of hunger and thirst; and so religion is the legitimate satisfaction of these inward spiritual cravings. Everywhere man has sought after God, if haply he might find Him. And this quest and its satisfaction in religion will not die out with the advance of culture and civilization. In the beginning of his recently published Cunningham Lectures on *The Psychology of the Christian Soul*, Mr. Steven quotes a striking passage written forty years ago by Mr. John (now Lord) Morley in his work *On Compromise*:

> 'The modern freethinker does not attack religion; he explains it. And what is more, he explains it by referring its growth to the better and not to the worse part of human nature. He traces it to men's cravings for a higher morality. He finds its source in their aspirations after nobler expression of that feeling for the incommensurable things, which is in truth, under so many varieties of inwoven pattern, the common universal web of religious faith.'

But, as Mr. Steven points out, a description of the psychology of religion does not dispose of religion itself. The cravings and aspirations of which Lord Morley speaks have themselves to be explained. Whence came they, and is there no legitimate way in which they can be satisfied? Individuals here and there may refuse to develop the religious instinct, they may check this, like any other emotion of their nature. Nay, there may even be encountered here and there a religious colour-blindness, as there is a physical colour-blindness. Those who are its victims are entitled to our commiseration, and those who refuse to develop this instinct do so to their own loss.

II. In the second place, a careful study of the religions of the world shows that *their essential differences consist in the varying degrees in which they have satisfied the cravings of the human soul.* It is sometimes imagined that one of the results of the Comparative Study of Religion is to destroy the unique character that has been claimed by Christians for the religions of the Old and New Testaments, and to assign to these their place alongside the other great faiths of the world, on a footing of equality with some, and of superiority, or even inferiority, to others. But it is not so. The comparative method is going to accomplish as much for religion, in the way of setting it in a true light and on a sound basis, as it has done in the natural sciences and in the spheres of grammar and philology. If it does nothing more, it will help us to understand Christian doctrine and Christian practice as we have never done before. We all know what, in the hands of Professor Ridgeway, the comparative study of religions has done for the religion of Greece. But we expect more than this. Comparative Religion (*pace* Dr. Owen Whitehouse, we use this phrase for shortness sake, while thoroughly agreeing with

[1] *De Rer. Nat.* v. 1198–1203.

him that it is open to serious objection) is going to supply in future the most potent of weapons to the Christian apologist. If the search for religion is the search for God, the perfect religion is that which secures the perfection of communion with God. Or, to put it in another way, the perfect religion is that which takes possession of man's whole being, which satisfies his intellect, controls his will, and provides proper scope for his emotions.[1] This perfect religion we find in the religion of Christ, or rather in Christ Himself. Man has a thirst for guidance; that thirst is satisfied by Him who is the Way. Man has a thirst for knowledge; that thirst is satisfied by Him who is the Truth. Man has a thirst for life—meaning by this term full scope for his affections and emotions; that thirst is satisfied by Him who is the Life. Other religions have been more or less successful in satisfying a part of man's nature; there are systems whose chief interest is intellectual, others whose mainspring is ethical, and yet others whose basis is feeling or emotion. These systems have offered only partial solutions of the problem. Christ's religion is the perfect solution: it lays hold of the intellect, it deeply stirs the feelings, and thereby moves the will and shapes the life.

All truth is wrapped up in Him who is the Author and the Perfecter of our faith—the truths of mental and moral and even physical science. The time will come when the 'riddle of the universe' will be read in the light of St. Paul's declaration that 'in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible . . . all things have been created through him, and unto him' (Col 1^{16}), or of the statement in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel that 'without him was not anything' (Jn 1^{3}). Do not the unity and the uniformity of Nature find a worthy explanation in the mediation of the Eternal Word between God and the world? Contrast with this the cosmogonies of ethnic religions. Does not the same function invest with special fittingness the great doctrine of the Atonement? And does it not account for the universality of the religious instinct of which we have spoken; does it not explain the identity of the needs expressed by mankind and the analogies between the means devised to meet these needs? If men are the offspring of God, if Christ is the Light of the world, the Light that lighteneth every man, it will not surprise us to find traces of a Divine revelation in many lands, or to discover the light shining with remarkable brilliancy in quarters far removed from what would once have been called the pale of revelation. Wherever true thoughts concerning God have been formed, the illumination has come from Him who is the Light of man. The spirit of Christ was bestowed upon other prophets than those of Israel, although the latter received a double portion of it. In ancient Babylonia and Egypt, in Greece and Rome, in India and China and Arabia, we hear the cry of the human heart for light, and the Divine answer to that cry was not withheld. The πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως ('by divers portions and in divers manners') method of revelation, spoken of by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, may be predicted of the whole course of the Divine preparation of the world for the Advent of Christ. God spoke to man by many tongues and in many languages; He spoke to them most clearly in the historical revelation of Himself in Israel—a revelation in which the work of the prophets formed a part, a revelation intended to train Israel to be a missionary nation, so that at last the many might be blessed through the agency of the few. But He spoke the last word through Christ. The religion of the future will not be, as some apparently imagine, a new syncretism of all that is best in all the religions of the world. We do not look to the Parliament of Religions for a perfect religion. Christianity already contains this. We may, indeed, have to develop points to which justice has not been done. But in germ all that man needs is here present. All preceding revelation culminated in the person of Jesus Christ; and the continued revelation of Himself which God still conveys through His spirit dwelling in His Church can never supersede but only interpret and develop the teaching of Him in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

Keeping in view the fact that the quest of religion is directed to the discovery of God, we note that Christ alone has revealed to men the truth concerning God; or, rather we should say, He Himself is the true revelation of God. Christ has for us the value or worth of God. So much is admitted by many who have no belief in and no patience with what they regard as metaphysical subtleties concerning the Persons of the Godhead and the Divinity of our Lord. It is not a little to get even this length, to be convinced that Christ

[1] Cf. Principal Iverach's *Theism*, London, 1900, p. 227 ff.

understood God as none else has ever understood Him, that His words express to us the truth concerning God, that His attitude to man is the true reflexion of God's attitude. Now, what was the distinctive feature of Christ's teaching concerning God? Was it not His revelation of God as Father? Long before, the Psalmist had declared, 'Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him' (Ps 103^{13}); but there we have only a beautiful *simile* after all, and scarcely anywhere else in the Old Testament is even that height reached. In fact, the nearer we come to the time of Christ, the more do we find the Jews disposed to exalt the transcendency of God, and to increase His distance from His creatures. In our Lord's day the spiritual guides of Israel had practically converted God into a magnified Rabbi, more interested in His law than in His children, a taskmaster who laid burdens heavy to be borne on men's shoulders. Through all this thicket of Rabbinical teaching Jesus cut His way to the central truth afterwards summed up in the words, 'God is love.' He did not, like Muhammad, point men to a Sovereign Will before which they must humbly bow, to which they must blindly submit; but to a Father, whose interest and whose pleasure alike lead Him to seek the welfare of His children. And in His own person He gave expression to the true feeling of the Divine heart when He cried: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. . . . For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light' (Mt 11^{28-30}).

The natural converse of Christ's teaching concerning God is found in His teaching concerning man. If God be the Father, all mankind are His children. Hence the value set by Christ on humanity, nay, on every human soul. Hence the emphasis of His parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, the Lost Son. Hence His unflinching optimism, and the hopefulness that led Him to despair of none, to seek the society of the classes despised by the scribes and Pharisees, and to proclaim it as His mission to seek and to save that which was lost. Other religions—Buddhism in particular—have had their Saviours, but the Christian religion alone can show a Saviour whose optimism carried lofty aims to a triumphant issue.

My comparative study of religions has led me to the conclusion that there is only one of the religions of the world that can be regarded as a serious rival to Christianity, and that is Buddhism. From Muhammadanism, although it is at present a very real danger when pressed on the acceptance of uncultured peoples in Africa, there is nothing to fear when it comes in contact with the higher civilizations. But Buddhism belongs to a different category. It has manifold points at which it appeals to the needs even of cultured men. Like Christianity, Buddhism is a universal religion in that it addresses its call to men everywhere without distinction of nationality. Its audience is suffering humanity. Buddha, like Jesus, claims to be a Redeemer. Both religions alike insist on the perishableness and emptiness of the world, and seek to turn their followers towards a higher life. But there are serious differences, when we compare the personality of the founders as well as the means whereby they taught men to reach the goal. The Christian religion is bound up with the personality of Jesus in a way in which Buddhism is not bound up with the personality of the Buddha. One alone could ever say, '*I* am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life,' or 'Come to *me*, and learn of me.' The dying Buddha expressly said, 'You are not to think that henceforth you have no longer a master; the doctrines and the laws of the Order which I have made known to you—these are to be your master when I am no more.' Jesus said, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father. I and the Father are one.' Buddha says in effect, 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the doctrine.' Moreover, there are many Buddhas; there is but one Christ. The Buddhist saves himself by keeping the law, the Christian is saved by trust in a Person. Buddhism, again, finds that the source of evil lies in existence itself: all desire, all will to live, all emotion must be rooted out. Jesus, on the other hand, wars only against the evil will. He aims not at the extinction of desire, but at the setting of desires on worthy objects; his goal is not *nirvāna*, but holiness.[1] With all that is noble in its aims and elevated in its moral teaching, we cannot but conclude that Buddhism falls far short of Christianity in its appeal to the deepest needs of human nature.

III. Every expression of the religious instinct we meet with deserves to be treated with *reverence and sympathy*. It is only by studying it in this spirit that we shall be able to appreciate the merits

[1] On this point see N. Söderblom, *Les Religions*, 1911, a little work to which the present writer desires to express his great indebtedness.

and discover the defects of any particular religion or religious belief or practice. The days are happily gone when it was considered legitimate to stigmatize whole religions as creations of the devil or as the offspring of imposture and fraud. Our missionaries are trained—or at least they ought to be—not to despise or to denounce the religious beliefs and practices of those to whom they carry the gospel, but to try to understand them, to think themselves into the mental and spiritual disposition of their hearers, to go as far along the road with them as possible, and, when they part company with them, to do so for reasons that shall be intelligible and that may appeal to those whom they are seeking to guide to a nobler faith.[1] It would not be a bad thing if the word 'superstition,' which has come to be one of what are called 'question-begging appellatives,' were banished from the study of religions. Take even such a primitive form of religion as is represented by Fetishism, which is a specialized form of Animism. When the savage has learned very slowly to look inward, to cease to regard himself as an object, to call himself 'I,' to realize himself as subject, as spirit, as personality, he begins presently to look upward,[2] to transfer this idea of spirit to objects around him, and in particular to fix upon certain objects as the home or dwelling-place of a spirit whose powers on his own behalf he seeks to evoke. The particular wonder-working object of the savage's reverence may seem contemptible enough to us; the devotion paid to it may strike us as absurd and even repellent; yet there is present here that element of mystery which—I say it with all reverence—is present in the sacraments of the Christian religion. As the savage believes in the mysterious *mana* already referred to, so in varying degrees the Christian attaches efficacy to the Sacraments.

Or, take what is a very prominent feature in most religions, the attempt to propitiate the Divine power or powers, or to enter into friendly relations with them. This finds expression, above all, in *sacrifice*. Whatever view be taken of the origin of sacrifice—if, in truth, it has only *one* meaning and not many—whether the gift-theory be accepted, or the theory of communion with the god, we shall find in all religions ready points of attachment for the Christian notions of atonement and communion with God. The costly gifts offered by the heathen to their gods, the readiness in many cases to offer even a child to please these deities, enforce the lesson taught to Abraham long ago that the best belongs to God, while at the same time they furnish the starting-point for teaching the higher truth, which Abraham had also to learn, that what God demands is the sacrifice of man's will, and not of his child. 'Obedience is better than sacrifice.' In like manner, the participation of the deity and his worshippers in a common meal, and even the notion expressed in the crude phrase 'eating the god,' have analogies in the Eucharist, which in reverent hands may be utilized both to commend the Christian religion to the heathen and to throw light upon the Christian practice itself.

IV. As what I have just said may seem to emphasize the human element in Christianity by showing how much it has in common with other religions, I think the proper emphasis is rather upon *the Divine element in all religions*. God has from the first been educating men in the knowledge of Himself. I am not one who has any belief in a primitive revelation—a theory to which it appears to me there are insuperable psychological as well as historical objections. The process has been one of storm and stress, of earnest striving and at times of seemingly hopeless groping; but it has been a progress. To take as an illustration our own religion which grew up on Semitic soil—the first beginnings are to be found thousands of years ago in Babylonia, whose wondrous religious literature has been brought to light within recent years. There we find men labouring to explain the origin of things in their Creation myths; we hear the outpouring of the human soul in penitential psalms; we find an appeal to religious emotion in an elaborate ritual system. Centuries pass, and a great religious development centres in the person of Abraham, who teaches his seed after him the knowledge, so far as he had attained it, of the true God. After a period of retrogression, a new religious leader arises in the person of Moses; and from a subsequent retrogression the great prophets arise to recall the people. Another retrogression follows in the legal system which ruled for centuries after the Exile, until the great prophet

[1] The present writer would enter his most earnest protest (a protest in which probably every student of Comparative Religion would join) against the extremely prejudiced and misleading account given of Brahmanism by Mr. Harold Begbie in his book (just published) entitled *Other Sheep* (Hodder & Stoughton). *Ne sutor supra crepidam!*

[2] Cf. Ed. Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, Glasgow, 1892, vol. i. p. 189.

John the Baptist came as the herald and forerunner of the last and greatest of the prophets, the God-man Jesus Christ, who ushered in the final, the absolute, universal religion. God's pædagogic method along that line of development was thus vindicated.

We might pursue a similar course of inquiry along the lines of development amongst other peoples. We might examine the search after God amongst the great Aryan races, the Hindus and the Greeks.[1] We might study the religious factors in Zoroastrianism, with its unsatisfying dualism, or the intensely interesting struggle of Buddhism to conquer and eliminate desire. But we must forbear. The lesson enforced by the study of all these religions is that more or less of Divine guidance has been vouchsafed to seekers after God and the truth in each one of them, that God has taught men, were it only by the failure of their efforts, to welcome the truth that is bound up in the Person of Jesus Christ, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The struggle has been a protracted one, and in many quarters it is not yet over; there have been frequent periods of religious stagnation or even of retrogression. Yet we are firmly persuaded that there has been a Divinely guided order of thoughts as well as events all through the ages, and that the knowledge of the true God is yet destined to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

> For, while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
> Seem here no painful inch to gain,
> Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
> Comes silent, flooding in, the main.[2]

[1] See chap. viii., entitled 'The Greek Solution,' in Principal Iverach's *Is God Knowable?* (London, 1877), a chapter which has been freely utilized (sometimes without acknowledgment) by subsequent writers.

[2] Clough.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ISAIAH.

ISAIAH XXX. 15.

'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.'

1. JUDAH was a little country, situated between two great military empires, Assyria and Egypt, just as Switzerland is situated between France and Germany. At the time to which the text refers there was great fear that Sennacherib, king of Assyria, would invade the land. The politicians of Judah were therefore very active in trying to arrange an offensive and defensive alliance with Egypt. At this critical juncture Isaiah issued a political manifesto in favour of rational non-intervention. In the chapter before us, in ever-memorable and ever-useful language, he warns his fellow-countrymen against dangerous entanglements with Egypt, and all other doubtful diplomatic proceedings. He entreats them to remember that the two conditions of national security are quietness and confidence; that is to say, minding their own business and putting their trust in God, carefully avoiding any interference with the affairs of other people, and relying, not upon military preparations, but upon doing their duty to God and man.

2. There is a character that is fussy, and flurried, and restless—totally without repose, totally without dignity, always in extremes. There is no perspective about it, no silence, no sobriety, no self-control; it values no blessing which it has, because it is always yearning for some blessing which it has not; it enjoys no source of happiness in the present, because it is always fretting for some source of happiness in the future. It is bred by a harassed age in which we find no leisure; in which

> The world is too much with us; late and soon,
> Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers:
> Little we see in Nature that is ours;
> We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon;

or, in which, as another expresses it, we

> See all sights from pole to pole,
> And glance, and nod, and bustle by;
> And never once possess our soul
> Before we die.

The text, beautiful in itself, has had for many a singular charm. It is the motto of that quiet and holy book which has soothed so many restless souls—the *Christian Year*.

I.

Quietness.

The lesson of quietness is set for us again and again in the Scriptures. We are told that the effect of righteousness is quietness. We are specially exhorted to 'study to be quiet'; to make a study of it as something to be learned, as one would learn an art or train one's self in beauty of living. In the margin the language is even stronger—'Be ambitious to be quiet.' Another saying of the New Testament is, referring to women, 'The apparel of a meek and quiet spirit is of great price in the sight of God.' Quietness is extolled, too, as a privilege in a noisy world. 'A dry morsel and quietness therewith is better than a feast with strife and contention.'

1. What is Quietness? Quietness is stillness, silence, meekness of soul. It is submission, surrender, sacrifice, self-renunciation. It assumes the giving up of the saved life into the Redeemer's keeping, and receiving it back again from Him with sweet contentment. It accepts with holy tenderness all His dealings and designs in carrying forward the education of the soul. It brings with it the entire absence of self-will, alongside of a beautiful and blessed manifestation of strength of will, and force of character, asserted all for Him.

Quietness is the reverse of excitement. There is no doubt that excitement has its place in the economy of God. That arousing, that stirring up, that quickening from lethargy, which makes activity a necessity, and existence a delight, has its place even in religion. Without excitement there can be no revival, no rising of a dead Church into a living and moving one. Wherever there has been torpor, wherever there has been sleep, wherever there has been indifference, there must be excitement before there can be energy. The day of Pentecost was a scene of great excitement: mocking bystanders even said, 'These men are full of new wine.' And St. Paul seems to recognize the parallel between the excitement of intemperance and the quickened pulsation of grace, when he says in his exhortation to the Ephesians, 'Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit.' Or St. James, 'Is any merry? let him sing psalms.'

Yet excitement is not strength. It may counterfeit it. It may even, for a moment or two, in a spasmodic, feverish, haphazard way, give an impulse not natural; nerve a weak arm for a feat of courage, or a feeble spirit for a prodigy of resistance. But when by strength we mean something inherent, something habitual, something permanent, we must look elsewhere for it than to excitement, whether we are speaking of the religious life, or of the life of time. Quietness is strength. It is the quiet nature that works. It is the quiet spirit that influences. It is the quiet life that impresses and that assimilates. Excitement 'rages and is confident.' Excitement talks and bustles and pushes. Excitement is the passion of an hour, the stimulus of a day. But excitement, if in any sense it stirs the world, cannot move and cannot guide it. There is only one kind of excitement which has permanence; and that is one which deserves a better name, and of which excitement is rather the shadow than the substance. Its proper name is not excitement but enthusiasm: and enthusiasm, being interpreted, is having God in us; and where God is, there is quietness, and there is strength.

In his *Eothen*, Kinglake describes the following incident, which occurred as he was on his way to the Dead Sea:—'We found that we had bivouacked upon a little patch of barley, plainly belonging to the men of the caves. . . . The saddling and loading of our beasts was a work which generally took nearly an hour, and before this was half over, daylight came. We could now see the men of the caves. They collected in a body, amounting, I thought, to nearly fifty, and rushed down towards our quarters with fierce shouts and yells. But the nearer they got, the slower they went; their shouts grew less resolute in tone, and soon ceased altogether. The fellows, however, advanced to a thicket within thirty yards of us, and behind this "took up their position." My men, without premeditation, did exactly that which was best; they kept steadily to their work of loading the beasts, without fuss or hurry; and, whether it was that they instinctively felt the wisdom of keeping quiet, or that they merely obeyed the natural inclination to silence which one feels in the early morning, I cannot tell; but I know that, except when they exchanged a syllable or two relative to the work they were about, not a word was said. I now believe that this quietness of our party created an undefined terror in the minds of the cave-dwellers, and scared them from coming on; it gave them a notion that we were relying on some resources which they knew not of. Several times the fellows tried to lash themselves into a state of excitement which might do instead of pluck. They would raise a great shout, and sway forward in a dense body from behind the thicket; but when they saw that their bravery, thus gathered to a head, did not even suspend the strapping of a portmanteau or the tying of a hat-box, their shout lost its spirit, and the whole mass was irresistibly drawn back, like a wave receding

from the shore. These attempts at an onset were repeated several times, but always with the same result. . . . We all marched off without hindrance.'

2. Where is quietness to be shown?

(1) There is the quietness of outward circumstances, when we are withdrawn from all the activities of life, and have not strength for any of them; when we have no power for anything, and are obliged to be still. God seems to speak of this kind of quiet when He says, in Hos 2^{14}, 'I will bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her,' or, as the margin renders it, 'speak to her heart.' There is a kind, soft, gentle Voice that can speak to the heart when we are withdrawn from the bustle of life. This is what David prayed for when he said, 'Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation.'

Griffith John was once driven by an angry mob out of a Chinese village, and thus describes his feelings: 'I never felt more calm in my life than I did in that storm. The Saviour was felt specially near as my Strength and Comforter. For about five minutes it appeared as if I were going to die, and yet the prospect did not disturb my peace in the least. When it was all over, I felt thankful that I had been permitted to shed my blood in the cause of Christ, for I had laboured for Him for many years, yet never before had I been called to lose a drop of blood for Him, and the thought brought real sweetness to my soul.'[1]

(2) There is quietness of heart. 'Quietness' in this clause appears to correspond to 'rest' in the preceding one. It is not activity, but repose. There are times when the mind is so pulled down by the body that it cannot make even a religious effort. It has no power to give out, and it is scarcely strong enough to take in. All it can do is to rest, and quietly to lean on the loving arm of the Lord; to rest and be thankful.

The gentlest thing in the world will over-ride the strongest.
With virtue and quietness one may conquer the world.
To remain gentle is to be invincible.[2]

Oh! how safe, how quiet is that state where the soul stands in pure obedience to the voice of Christ, for watchful care is maintained not to follow the voice of a stranger! Here Christ is felt to be our Shepherd, and, under His leading, people are brought to a stability; and where He doth not lead forward, we are bound in the bonds of pure love to stand still and wait upon Him.[3]

[1] Wardlaw Thompson's *Griffith John*, 359.
[2] Lao-Tze, *The Simple Way*.
[3] John Woolman's *Journal*.

II.

Confidence.

Confidence, says the prophet, is strength. We know that there is a counterfeit confidence which is no strength. There is a vain confidence, and there is a false confidence—a confidence placed in an impostor, or placed in an idol, or placed in self. The confidence which is strength is, first of all, a confidence rightly directed; and secondly, a confidence stoutly held. The confidence of which Isaiah wrote was, of course, set upon God. And then, being thus rightly directed, it was a confidence which knew no wavering as to its right to trust, and as to its acceptance with its Object.

1. What is Confidence? Confidence is the opposite of mistrust. Certainly no one ever thought that mistrust was strength. We all know what mistrust has done in camps and armies; what mistrust has done in houses and families; how it has defeated the best-laid plans, and separated chief friends. We all know that confidence in a great general has carried troops through exhausting marches, and given victory against overwhelming odds; has been the secret of political cohesion, and the explanation of national ascendancy; has given life itself its security, and made the Englishman's house his castle.

Confidence gives moral muscle and sinew to the quietness. It braces and strengthens it, for it links the fortunes of the saved sinner with those of the God who saves him. All the future is provided for. It has been said that half the world is unable to enjoy to-day, because haunted with the guilty memories of yesterday; and the other half, because haunted with fears and anxieties about to-morrow. This miserable existence may come to an end at once and for ever. Isaiah's gospel gives it its deathblow. In returning and resting, there is found God's great salvation, and the past is all forgiven. In quietness and confidence there comes to us, like an inspiration, the assurance that the future is all provided for and absolutely secure in Christ, and that as our day our strength shall be: 'For this God is our God for ever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death.'

Moffat was the right man for the place. Nothing discouraged him, nothing baffled him. He was possessed of an unceasing purpose to do without flinching what he

believed God intended he should do. He had been instrumental in preventing some savage practice, and the angry chief and his picked men came to demand that the missionaries should leave the country. They were armed, and it was evident that they meant mischief. Moffat stood fearlessly before them, closing his reply to their demands with the words, 'Our hearts are with you.' Then he added, as he bared his breast, 'If you will, drive your spears to my heart; and when you have slain me, my companions will know that the hour has come for them to depart.' Such bravery awakened in the savages enough admiration to cause them to leave their intended victims unmolested. 'These men must have ten lives when they are so fearless of death,' declared the chief to his followers. 'There must be something in immortality.'[1]

2. And where is our confidence to be placed? Confidence is not faith in a system, but trust in a Person. You have confidence in those about you, so you trust them. You have confidence in a loving Father, and trust Him.

(1) Confidence in His love. When we think of what He has done, and how God loved the world, we may be quite sure that He has loved us; sure also that He who has loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, will love us unto the end, and will keep us as the apple of His eye.

(2) Confidence in His plans. He has His own plans for us all. He knows exactly what we want, and what is really best for each of us, and He never makes a mistake in planning for our good. So we may rest in the quiet confidence that all that God plans for us is the very best that could be planned. 'As for God, his way is perfect.'

(3) Confidence in the fulness and completeness of our reconciliation. This lies at the bottom of all trust, and what a noble foundation it is for it! Look at the blood of atonement, the life of the Son of God. Look at the love that prompted it, the sacrifices made in it, and the promises of free forgiveness founded upon it. Think of what God has done and why He did it, and then rest in quiet trust that every sin of the whole life, whether in action or in heart, has long since been blotted out for ever.

Most travellers in the United States have seen the beautiful pass in the White Mountains, known as the Crawford Notch, and have heard the story of the disaster that there befell the Willey family in the autumn of 1826.

The summer had been one of unusual drought. The earth to a great depth was as dry as powder. Then came two days of unprecedented downpour. Thousands of tons of earth and rock were loosed from the overhanging mountains, and slid with frightful roar to the narrow valley below. The little house of Samuel Willey was in evident danger. In front, separated from it by a bit of pasture, was the towering wall of Mount Webster. Immediately behind the house, for two thousand feet, rose the steep side of Mount Willey. No one knows just when the fatal avalanche came. The family evidently anticipated the danger, probably saw or heard the coming avalanche, for they all met death outside of the house. The entire household of nine persons were killed. But the house from which they had fled was untouched. A sharp ledge of rock above the house divided the downpouring mass of earth and trees and rock into two streams, which passed on either side of the house and again united in front, covering the little meadow with débris thirty feet high. Had they remained in the house, seeing that it was protected by that jutting crag of immovable rock, they would have been safe.

This illustrates Isaiah's ground of confidence, when Jerusalem was in a panic. He knew that the Lord Jehovah, as a strong immovable rock, would protect Zion; and that against Him the Assyrian avalanche would split, and break itself. To forsake Jehovah's protection, and run to Egypt for safety would only put Israel in the track of the destroying avalanche. Therefore, he cried: 'In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.'

III.

Strength.

'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.' This is Isaiah's strong conviction drawn from his vision of the righteousness of God. The prophet had strong feelings; he knew the sweetness of rapturous spiritual experience, he had passed through the agony of conflict and entered into the joy of victory. But he is often seen standing in a position which contrasts strongly with that taken by the people. They are panic-stricken; he can command them to put away their fear and look to God for deliverance. When they are carried away with joy at an unexpected deliverance, a deliverance that he had prophesied, he warns them to prepare for God's searching judgments. In both cases he is working from the same principle; what he calls for is a deeper life. They are faint-hearted in the day of danger because they fear men rather than God; they are carried away by shallow excitement because escape from the foreign foe seems to be the supreme salvation. His strong faith keeps him from being carried away by these surface currents, his feet are on the solid rock, he proves that the man who fears God sincerely and intelligently need fear nothing else. The world is not ruled by clever politicians or successful soldiers, there is a God of righteousness who takes

[1] W. S. Naylor, *Daybreak in the Dark Continent*, 217.

final responsibility on Himself; hence it is only the chaff that the wind drives away, only the wood, hay, and stubble that the fire consumes.

There is a great difference between strength and help. Help is assistance given from without, strength is power imparted within. When it says, He is our strength, it teaches us that He imparts power. If He were to make us so vigorous that we could walk ten miles to-morrow, He would then be strength to our body. And if He were to give us such mental vigour that we could read, and think, and write, and work, then He would be strength to our mind. But, perhaps, He gives us neither the one nor the other. We feel no vigour for either a bodily or a mental effort. Still He is our strength, for He enables us just to lean on His own arm, and trust Him. We have strength for the soul even when we have no strength for the mind or body; for God the Holy Ghost may so bring home to our heart the perfection of our blessed Saviour, the completeness of His atoning sacrifice, and the sufficiency of His High-priesthood, that we may be enabled to lean all our weight on Him, and so be 'strengthened with might by his Spirit,' not in the outer, but 'in the inner man.'

Racket and Rest, by Harold Begbie, closes with the scene in which the widow seeks to convey to her daughter-in-law, Dolly, who has become stone deaf, and whose career had been given to an actress's excitement and racket, the secret of her life. The story tells how Dolly has come to the invalid's room with her baby and her older girl, Dorothea. And when the baby has been sent out with Dorothea, and Dolly is left with her mother-in-law, she says to her—

'I want very much to hear you speak, and I cannot. You don't know how greatly I long to hear your voice.' She bent and kissed the widow's hand. 'When I could hear you,' she said, 'I would not listen. This is my punishment. But you can hear me, and I want to tell you that I am sorry for all the rude things I ever said to you, and very sorry for all the unkind things I ever thought about you.' She kissed her hand again.

The widow's eyes were full of the bright light of kindness. Her lips opened, and she said softly: 'In returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.'

'You are speaking, and I cannot hear you,' said Dolly, lifting her trumpet.

The widow stretched out her hands, drew Dolly down to her, and kissed her brow.

'It would be difficult for you to make me hear,' Dolly said, putting away the trumpet. There were tears in her eyes. For the first time in her life she felt the wisdom of goodness. The death of this beautiful old lady was without tears. Whatever mystery hung behind the dark curtain it could not affright her. She had lived a good life, her heart was pure, her hands were clean, her eyes were full of sweetness. The end of her life had come. Death was in the room. She was radiant with serenity. Dolly wondered why everybody did not think more often of their death. Death is so certain. Life flies away. It is wise to be good. 'Will you tell Dorothea,' she said, 'when she is alone with you, so that she can tell me afterwards, how you managed in your training of Theodore? You were always kind and loving; but you were also wise and strict. I want to know how you managed. He loved you all through his boyhood, and yet you never spoilt him. You were a perfect mother. I want to be as like you as I can. Will you tell Dorothea? You see how I have altered! I want my little boy to grow up like your son. You have changed me.'

The widow put out her hand towards her Bible, but checked herself, and took a pencil and tablet which rested on a table at her side, and wrote the words:

In returning and rest shall ye be saved;
In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.

She did not point out the words in Isaiah, because her fine spirit, her thoughtfulness for others, which lasted to the very end of her life, knew that poor Dolly would be hurt by the concluding words, 'And ye would not.' Her finger pointed to the word 'Rest,' for a long time. Then it moved to 'Quietness' and 'Confidence,' and finally to 'Strength,' where it tarried. Then she gave the paper to Dolly, and smiled into her eyes.

1. This is the distinguishing feature of individual strength, of a strong personality, of a strong *man*, even quietness and confidence. It is this, the reserve power, the hidden strength, the restrained and concealed activity, which makes a great and powerful man. We are mistaken if we think that we are drawn to men, or that they become popular or famous, because of what they do, or of the efforts they put forth. It is not the straining or the striving, however successful; it is not brilliant conversation, however sparkling; it is not marked ability, however masterful,—which makes a man great, or makes him loved. It is something far deeper than all these, something in the restfulness of the man, in the quiet confidence of his manner, in the repose of his great spirit which attracts other men to him.

Serene, I fold my hands and wait,
Nor care for winds, nor tide, nor sea;
I rave no more 'gainst time or fate,
For lo! my own shall come to me.

I stay my haste, I make delays,
For what avails this eager pace?
I stand amid the eternal ways,
And what is mine shall know my face.

Asleep, awake, by night or day,
The friends I seek are seeking me;
No winds can drive my bark astray
Nor change the tide of destiny.

What matter if I stand alone?
I wait with joy the coming years;
My heart shall reap where it has sown,
And garner up its fruit of tears.

The stars come nightly to the sky,
The tidal wave unto the sea;
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,
Can keep my own away from me.[1]

2. This is the secret of strength in a Church. The Church has a great work to do, and of all great enterprises stillness is a characteristic. The ascending water, the descending rain, the revolving planet, the electric current are all illustrative of mighty law combined with mighty stillness. The great upholders of, and sufferers for, our common Christianity have always been the quiet men, the silent people. But the strength of Christ's Church does not lie in quietness more than in confidence. The latter is the cause and condition of the former. God would here expressly teach His people that their hope was faith in God, in taking Him at His word, in preserving their position as God had given it, in receiving by simple faith the strength that He had promised, and in expecting confidently the victory which He had told them would be surely theirs. It was the same truth as St. John taught when he said, 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'

[1] John Burroughs.

Dr. J. Campbell Gibson, in his *Mission Problems and Mission Methods in South China* (p. 256), gives the following experience of a persecuted Chinese woman:—

She had been the means of leading her husband to Christ. In the persecution which followed, her husband fled for refuge to the chapel in the neighbourhood; she remained in the village to bear the brunt of the opposition. 'She was not allowed to draw water from the village well. None would sell rice or any food to her; none would speak to her. Her own daughter, when she heard that her parents had burned the family idols, cast them off and would not acknowledge them as her parents. Yet the woman herself testified that during this time of trial she was never cast down. "The Lord," she said, "never left us, not for an hour, else how would these people not have destroyed us altogether? We were being persecuted and hated, yet in my heart there was peace." Her own son took an active part in the persecution, but he too was won at length. Besides her husband, her son, her mother, her younger brother, and two sisters were brought to Christ under her influence. She was afterwards the means of bringing in many more.'

Light upon Early Babylonian History.

By T. G. Pinches, LL.D., M.R.A.S., Lecturer in Assyrian at University College, London.

That the recovery of the early Babylonian chronological lists, and therefore of the history of the country in primitive times, is far from being hopeless, is proved by the document just issued in the *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* for October 1911, where the Rev. P. Scheil publishes a tablet which has recently come into the hands of a private collector. This text gives the dynasties in power before the Gutian invasion, which took place about 2500 B.C.

The text in question must have measured, when complete, about 7 inches long by 3½ in. wide. The writing is large and well formed, and originally consisted of about 29 lines on the obverse, of which 25 remain, and 21 on the reverse, of which 18 remain. The tablet is damaged in places, but the principal harm which it has sustained is the loss of the lower end of the obverse, which has taken away about four lines from that side, and the beginning of the reverse, with three or four more lines besides. In all, the names of seven kings are wanting at this point, though one of them—perhaps two—can be restored from other sources.

To make the document look complete, a fragment of another tablet, of nearly the same width, and similar as to colour of clay, has been joined on. It is to be hoped, however, that this can be detached without injury to either document, as it is of an entirely different nature, referring, as it does, to certain square roots similar to those published in the *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. iv. pl. 37 [40], and by Hilprecht in the *University of Pennsylvania Expedition*, vol. xx.

The text of the chronological list is in Sumerian, and reads as follows:

Upi$^{(ki)}$-a Un-zi Lugal-am ušu mu in-ak
Un-da-lu-lu û-mina mu in-ak

3. *Ur-saga* *âš mu in-ak*
Bâ-ša-(d.)Utuki *niša mu in-ak*
I-šu-il *niš-lama mu in-ak*
6. *Šu-(d.)En-zu dumu I-šu-il-ge î-mina mu in-ak*
Âš lugal-e-ne mu-bi šuš-ušu-îlima mu in-ak-eš
Upia(ki)-a bala-bi ba-kur nam-lugala-bi Kis(ki) šu-ba-tum.

At Opis, Un-zi became king, he ruled 30 years.
Undalulu, he ruled 12 years.
3. Ur-saga, he ruled 6 years.
Ba-ša-Utuki, he ruled 20 years.
Išu-il, he ruled 24 years.
6. Šu-Enzu (I.), son of Išu-il, he ruled 7 years.
6 kings, they ruled 99 years.

The rule at Opis was changed, Kis acquired the dominion.

9. *Kis(ki)-a Azag-(d.)Ba-u sal (lu2)kaš-tin-na suḫuš Kis(ki) mu-un-gi-na*
lugal-am *šuš-nimin mu in-ak*
Ba-ša-(d.)Enzu dumu Azag-(d.)Ba-u-ge
niš-ia mu in-ak
12. *Sur-(d.)Za-ga-ga*[1] *dumu Ba-ša-(d.)En-zu*
âš mu in-ak
Zi-mu-dar *ušu mu in-ak*
U-zi-wa-dar dumu Zi-mu-dar-ra-ge âš mu in-ak
15. *El-mu-ti*[2] *û-gi mu in-ak*
I-mu-(d.)Babbar *û-gi mu in-ak*
Na-ni-ia-' *eš mu in-ak*
18. *ussa lugal-e-ne mu-bi îlima-šuš-nimin-âš in-ak-eš*
Kis(ki) bala-bi ba-kur nam-lugala-bi Unug(ki) šu-ba-tum.

9. At Kis, Azag-Bau, wife[3] of a wine-merchant, became queen,[4] she ruled 100 years.
Ba-ša-Enzu (II.), son of Azag-Bau, ruled 25 years.
12. Sur-Zagaga, son of Ba-ša-Enzu, ruled 6 years.
Zimudar ruled 30 years.
Uziwadar, son of Zimudar, ruled 6 years.
15. Elmuti[5] ruled 11 years.
Imu-Babbar[6] ruled 11 years.
Nania'[7] ruled 3 years.
18. 8 kings, they ruled 586 years.

[1] In this and other names beginning with UR, I transcribe *sur*, as is indicated in the fragment of the Gilgameš-legend discovered and published by Meissner (see *PSBA* for May 1903, p. 115, iv. 3–4: *Su-ur-Su-na-bu* for *Ur-Šanabi*).
[2] Or *Im-mu-ti*.
[3] Lit. 'woman.'
[4] Lit. 'became king.'
[5] Or *Immuti*.
[6] Or *Ikul-Babbar*.
[7] Or *Naniaḫ*.

The rule of Kis was changed, Erech acquired the dominion.

Unug(ki)-ga Lugal-zag-gi-si lugal-am
niš-ia mu in-ak
21. *Gi lugal mu-bi* *niš-ia in-ak*
Unug(ki)-ga bala-bi ba-kur nam-lugala-bi A-ga-de(ki) šu-ba-tum.

At Erech, Lugal-zaggi-si became king, he ruled 25 years.
21. 1 king, he ruled 25 years.

The rule of Erech changed, Agade acquired the dominion.

A-ga-de(ki)-a Šar-ru-ki-in ab-ba-ni nu-giš-šar
24. *qa-šu-gab* *ê(d.)Za-ga-ga*
lugal A-ga-de(ki) . . . . . *-du-a*
. . . . . *mu in-ak*
27. . . . . .

(About four lines are wanting here.)

REVERSE.

(About three lines lost here.)

A-ba-îlu . . . mu *in-ak*
I-li-i-din-[nam] *I-mi-îlu*
3. *Na-nu-um-šarru* *I-lu-lu-qar*
lama-bi *eš mu in-ak-eš*
Du-du *niš-gi mu in-ak*
6. *Su-kar-kib dumu Du-du-ge* *û-ia mu in-ak*
û-mina lugal-e-ne mu-bi eš šuš û-îmina in-ak-eš
A-ga-de(ki) *bala-bi ba-kur*
9. *nam-lugala-bi* *Unug(ki) šu-ba-tum.*

At Agade, Šarru-kîn, his protector[8] a gardener
24. libation-priest of the temple of Zagaga, became (?) king of Agadé;
he ruled . . . years.
(Here comes the break between the obverse and the reverse, representing about seven lines.)
Abâ-îlu, he ruled . . . years.
Ili (?)-idin[nam], Imi-îlu,
3. Nanu[m]-šarru, Iluluqar,
these 4, they ruled 3 years.
Dudu, he ruled 21 years.
6. Šukarkib, son of Dudu, he ruled 15 years.
12 kings, they ruled 197 years.
The rule of Agadé was changed,
9. Erech acquired the dominion.

Unug(ki)-ga Sur-nigin lugal-am eš mu in-ak
Sur-(gi2)gigir dumu Sur-nigina-ge âš mu in-ak

[8] Lit. 'elder,' 'father,' or the like; but the character *ab* is broken, and somewhat doubtful.

12. *Kud-da* *âš mu in-ak*
Ba-ša-ni-ni (or *Ba-ša-i-li*) *ia mu in-ak*
Sur-(d.)Babbar *âš mu in-ak*
15. *Ia* *lugal-e-ne mu-bi niš-âš in-ak eš*
Unug(ki)-ga bala-bi *ba-kur*
nam-lugala-bi ugnum Gu-ti-um(ki) *šu-ba-tum*

At Erech, Sur-nigin became king,
he ruled 3 years.
Sur-gigir, son of Sur-nigin, he ruled 6 years.
12. Kudda, he ruled 6 years.
Ba-ša-nini (-ili), he ruled 5 years.
Sur-Babbar, he ruled 6 years.
15. 5 kings, they ruled 25 years.
The rule of Erech was changed,
the army of Gutium acquired the dominion.

After a space, comes the date when the tablet was written, the month and the day, but not the year, for which the scribe apparently trusted his memory:

Iti Šeg-a û ušu-kam

Month Sivan, day 30th.

This important chronological document is apparently an early copy of a part of the text published by the late Geo. Smith in the third vol. of the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, 1874 (paper read Nov. 4th, 1873). The text brought to the notice of the world by Smith was regarded by him as being 'Fragments of an inscription giving part of the chronology from which the Canon of Berosus was copied,' and this, in fact, is the title of his paper. It has remains of the first column, parts of four lines of the second, parts of five lines of the fourth, and 15 lines of the fifth, the third and sixth columns being entirely lost. The tablet now published by Father Scheil contains the contents, or part of the contents, of the lost third column. Between the dynasty of Gutium and that of Babylon, with which the fourth column of Smith's fragment, as preserved, begins, Scheil places the dynasties of Ur and of Isin. Fixing the date of Ḫammurabi at about 2100 B.C., and adding to this the total of the dynasties whose duration is given,—Opis, 99 years; Kis, 192 (or 586) years;[1] the first of Erech, 25 years; Agadé, 197 years; the second of Erech, 26 years; Ur, 117 years; and Isin, 225 years,—we obtain a total of 881 years, to which we have to add the duration of the Gutian dynasty, which was given on the next tablet of the series. What other dynasties ought to be inserted where the various lists are pieced together, and also how many dynasties preceded those given by this new text, is not known. It is to be noted, however, that as far as can be seen, there was no overlapping. A Median dynasty, which may be identical with that of Gutium in this tablet, is said by Berosus and Abydenus to have reigned for 224 years, and to have consisted of 8 kings, headed by Zoroaster (?). Adding this provisionally, we get about 1105 years B.C. as the total to be added to the date of Ḫammurabi for the earliest ruler, Unzi (or Kalamzi)—3205 B.C. This makes the date of Sargon of Agadé to have been about 2889 B.C.—more or less—against the 3800 years B.C. indicated by the chronology of the scribes of Nabonidus. The evidence of the American excavations at Niffer, where the bricks of Sargon of Agadé are said to occur immediately under those of Sur-Engur in the ruins of the great Temple-tower, has, therefore, about the value which was attributed to it. There were probably only 13 kings between these two rulers, with a total (including the 225 years of the Median dynasty) of 250 years. Whether the Median kings restored the Babylonian temples or not is doubtful—their religious beliefs probably differed entirely, especially if the authorities mentioned be correct in giving the name of the first king of the dynasty as Zoroaster (?).

With regard to the dynasties themselves, the earliest given by this tablet, that of Opis, is new to us. It is noteworthy that though the first four names are Sumerian, Išuil may be Semitic, and the Sumerian Šu-Enzu may be read in Semitic as Gimil-Sin. Gimil-Sin II., son of Sur-Bau, and grandson of Dungi, belonged to the dynasty of Ur, which reigned at a later date. Noteworthy is the name of the third ruler, Ursag, 'the warrior' or 'hero.' A ruler of Opis named Zuzu, defeated by Ê-anna-tum, *iššak* of Lagaš, is regarded by Scheil as having in all probability reigned later.

The position of Opis is not yet definitively known, but Winckler and Hommel agree in placing it on the right bank of the Tigris, below Bagdad. In a text detailing the advantages of pilgrimages, Upê (Opis) occurs between two mentions of a place called Laban; in the 2nd vol. of the *Cuneiform Inscr. of W. Asia*, Upî (Opis) occurs on the same line as the city of Eššu, and before Êridu, the

[1] For possible explanations of the discrepancy between the real total and that given by the scribe, see Scheil's paper in the *Comptes Rendus*, 1911, p. 612.

Babylonian sacred city, and Ni-tuk (Tilmun, regarded as the head of the Persian Gulf, including the island of Bahrein). The archaic geographical list in the 4th vol. of the same work, pl. 36 [38], has the ideograph for Opis after that for the city now represented by Jokha, and before Magan and Meluḫḫa (east and west Arabia, including the peninsula of Sinai—see Hommel, *Grundriss der Geographie und Geschichte des alten Orients*). Though these lists are not of much use in determining the positions of cities, there seems to be confirmation here in the position assigned to Opis.

From Opis, the dominion passed to Kis, now represented by the site Oheimer, formerly written Hymer, described by Layard as being about eight miles NE. of Hillah (Babylon). From its size, it was a place of considerable importance, and must have occupied the position in primitive times which Babylon assumed later. Azag-Bau, in Semitic Bau-êllit, seems to have been the first ruler of the united Babylonian states, and though only the wife of a wine-seller, founded the city of Kis. The length of her reign, which is set down at 100 years, needs explanation—it may be that she reigned so long that people lost count, or she may have had a daughter with whom she shared the throne, and the latter continued in her name after Azag-Bau had passed away.[1] Her name is found in the following omen:

'If a young animal be male and female,
it is the omen of Azag-Bau,
who ruled the land—
the king forsook (?) the land.'

It is a great gain to have found the relative position of queen Azag-Bau, more especially as her name is given after that of Sargon (of Agadé) in the bilingual list of rulers in *Western Asia Inscriptions*, vol. v. pl. 44. The line following states, however, that the names are not in their proper order. No other known king of Kis occurs among the remaining names of the new tablet.

Though his power passed away after his death, Lugal-zaggi-si, king of Erech, who succeeded to the overlordship of Babylonia, was one of the most renowned rulers of ancient Babylonia. Originally *iššak* of Umma, he ravaged and captured Lagaš, and claims to have carried his arms beyond the Tigris and the Euphrates, and as far as the upper sea. He was a contemporary of Uru-ka-gina of Lagaš, whose date is likewise brought into the possibility of being fixed.

The statement concerning Šarru-kîn, as Šargāni of Agadé is here called, is exceedingly interesting. The autobiographical legend concerning him is well known. It states that he was the 'mighty king, the king of Agadé.' His mother was a priestess, he knew not his father, and his uncle was a mountaineer ('loved the mountain'). It was in the city of Azupirānu, lying upon the Euphrates, that she conceived him, and brought him forth in a secret place. She then laid him in a receptacle whose opening she closed with bitumen, and committed him to the river, which did not overwhelm him, but carried him to Akki, the A-BALA or *naq mê*, 'the outpourer of the (holy) water,' who adopted him, and made him his orchard-keeper, in which capacity the goddess Ištar favoured him. How he became king is not stated, but at the time of the composition of this legend he is said to have reigned a number of years ending in 5—35, 45, or 55 years. He then goes on to speak of his conquests, and makes recommendations to the king who should come after him.

This ignorance as to who his father was is not confirmed by his historical inscriptions, however, for he states, on his bricks, that he was son of Dati-Bêl. The next name in this list was probably that of Narâm-Sin, his son, who, according to Nabonidus, reigned 3200 years before his time—*i.e.* about 3750 B.C. Whether there was more than one Babylonian Sargon is doubtful, but it is to be noted that there is a very curious entry, apparently referring to this king, in the *W. Asia Inscriptions*, vol. ii. pl. 48, i. l. 40, where the ancient Babylonian form of the character for 'king,' doubled, the lower component slightly different, and glossed *dadru*, is explained as *Šarru-kîn* (Sum. *Lugal-gina*), *šar kêtti*, *dabib kêtti*, *dabib damqāti*, 'Sargon, king of justice, pronouncer of justice, pronouncer of good fortunes.' This would seem to imply that he was in some way twice a king—either morally, by the nobility of his character, or because of a belief that he had appeared on earth again in the person of a later ruler bearing the same or a similar name.[2] It seems unlikely

[1] 120 years of life and 100 years of rule, however, would not be impossible.

[2] See my paper in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology* for Jan. 13, 1885, p. 65 ff. Professor Hommel seems to have come to the same conclusion (*ib.* p. 68, footnote) a couple of years earlier.

that Šargani and Šarru-kîn are the names of two kings which have been confused; but such a thing is not impossible—in any case, the inscriptions of Babylonia will probably ultimately set us on the right track.

Father Scheil also announces that he has found, engraved upon a votive piece of marble, in a private collection, the name of Ašlultu[m], wife of a certain Šarru-kîn.

In all probability the later kings of Agadé, whose names are all new to us, were far from being as warlike as Šarru-kîn and his immediate successors, and the dominion of Babylonia passed again to Erech under Sur-nigin. He reigned only three years, and was followed by his son; but the absence of any indication of relationship among their successors suggests that, though Erech retained the overlordship, the remaining kings of the dynasty did not reign in a direct line. This, with the short duration of their reigns, seems to indicate, as Professor Scheil points out, the instability of their position, and the possibility of divisions, and consequently of weakness, in Babylonia generally. Now, therefore, was the opportunity of the warlike rulers of Gutiu[m], and Babylonia fell, for a time, under their dominion. The next dynasty in chronological order was that of Ur (about 2300 B.C.), which may have been the rescuer, so to say, of Babylonia from the foreign yoke which oppressed her. Unfortunately, the first years of Dungi's reign are wanting in the chronological date-list from Niffer which has been published by Prof. Hilprecht, so that we have no record of any campaigns which he may then have made.[1] If the tablets of the preceding period were written under the Gutian rulers of Babylonia, it seems probable that the kings of that dynasty did not reside in Babylonia, but governed from their own capital. It would also suggest an explanation for such a date as 'Year the water returned' (? to its former level); but be this as it may, the tablet bearing this date-colophon[2] refers to 'oxen and sheep of (*or* for) the king of the Gutians,' and others refer to butter and oil for the land of Gutiu[m].[3]

In the tablet of which fragments were published in 1873 by the late George Smith there were about two columns of Babylonian dynasties preceding the earliest given here.[4] It would almost be worth while sifting the earth of the old palaces of Nineveh over again, with the hope of finding further fragments—not only of this, but also of numerous other inscriptions of importance.

[1] For a translation of this, see *Amherst Tablets*, vol. i. p. xiv.
[2] *Ib.* p. 15. [3] *Ib.* p. 20.
[4] See L. W. King's copy in his *Chronicles concerning early Bab. Kings*, vol. ii. pp. 143 and 145.

The Resurrecting Energy of God.

By the Rev. J. M. Shaw, M.A., Logiepert.

'The exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to that working of the might of his strength which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead . . . and (raised) you, when ye were dead in trespasses and sins.'—Eph $1^{19f.}$ 2^{1}.

The power of God which energized and operated in Christ in raising Him from the dead—that, and nothing less, is the power which energizes and operates in men as often as they are raised from the death of trespasses and sins. Such, it would seem, is the message of these words of St. Paul. To realize the significance of this message, let us see the lie of the Apostle's thought.

I.

In this letter 'to the Ephesians'—a circular letter or encyclical written from Rome to Ephesus and other Churches of Asia Minor—Paul dwells, to begin with, on the great fundamental truths of the gospel, the gospel of the revelation of 'the mystery of the Christ,' as he is fond of calling it, with a view to leading the members of the several congregations to a deeper and larger knowledge of the purposes of God in grace. The letter opens with a great outburst of wondering adoration and praise. As Paul gets up to the heights and, with widened horizon, surveys the revelation of the mercy and grace of God in Christ, at once in its beginnings, in its course, and in its contemplated end or issue, he can but give expression to his feelings in a great and grand doxology of holy exultation: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessing in the heavenlies in Christ' (1^{3}).

So overwhelmed is he with his panoramic vision that he is swept along in exultant contemplation, hardly knowing where he is going, one wondering thought pressing so quick upon another that his very grammar is hard put to it to express what he wishes to convey.

From doxology the Apostle passes to prayer, to definite prayer for the members of the congregations of Asia Minor, and that for a definite end. Prayer it is, mixed, as was Paul's wont, with thanksgiving—'in everything with thanksgiving' (Phil 4^6) was one of the guiding principles of Paul's prayer life—with thanksgiving for what, he hears, they have already been enabled to attain in the Christian life on which they have entered through this doxology-inducing grace of God. These attainments, however, are only, as it were, the first-fruits, the 'earnest' of what is to come. And as he surveys the greatness of the end to which they are called, he is moved, he tells them, to continual prayer for them that they may be led by the Spirit of God—the 'Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation' (v.[17])—to a larger insight into and experience-knowledge, not only of the far-reaching purpose of God in their salvation—'the hope of his calling, and the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints' (v.[18]),—but, above all, of 'the exceeding greatness' of the power which He has put at their disposal for attaining this great end and purpose. A power it is, this, the greatness of the measure of which he finds in that mighty manifestation of its working which we have in the Resurrection and Exaltation of Jesus Christ. 'According to the working (or energy) of the might of his strength,' says Paul, accumulating epithet upon epithet as if struggling with an idea too large for words to express, 'which he wrought in the Christ when he raised him from the dead and set him at his right hand in the heavenlies.' Such, and nothing short, is the measure, the 'according-to'-ness, of the power made available through Christ for redemptive ends.

II.

Now, to realize the 'exceeding greatness' of this power or energy, we must let our minds dwell upon the unique and peculiar manifestation of its working to which Paul here refers—the raising of our Lord from the dead.

In the Gospels we read of several instances of Jesus raising people from the dead, but these are on quite a different level from His own Resurrection. When the daughter of Jairus was brought back from death at the word of Jesus, she returned to the same conditions of life that she had lived before she died—a life of mortality and subjection to human weakness. Illness came to her again, and the day came when she died a second time and was buried. So it was with the young man at Nain. So also it was with Lazarus. At the command of Jesus they returned from the circumstance of death, living men, resuscitated but still mortal, doomed again to see corruption.

But not so with Jesus. His Resurrection was no mere return from the grave on this side—a return to the life which death had interrupted. He passed through death and issued on the immortal side, escaped from the bondage of corruption. His Resurrection meant an entrance on a new life under altogether new conditions. Indeed, it was only a stage—the first step—on the path of Exaltation, and the greatness of the Resurrection for Paul consisted in the fact that it was the entrance of the risen Jesus on a state of Exaltation at God's right hand in the heavenlies, 'far above every principality, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come' (v.[21]), that is to say, above every conceivable dignity and power of this world or the next, call them by whatever name you please. Or, as he puts it in the letter to the Philippians: 'God hath highly exalted him, and given him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father' (2^{9-11}).

The 'exceeding greatness' of 'the energy of the might of his strength' involved in such a change in the experience of Jesus, we can come within sight of aright appreciating only if we do justice, to begin with, to the true humanity of Jesus' earthly state. Between His earthly humiliation and the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, the distance was immeasurable. In coming to earth He 'emptied' Himself, He 'laid aside' His glory. He did not go through the world disguised in human form, as a king might go about in disguise among his subjects. He became man, taking 'the form of a servant,' and coming into a position of absolute dependence on the Father, like ourselves. He thus shared all the essential

(sinless) limitations of man. He grew in bodily stature from childhood to boyhood, from boyhood to manhood. He hungered and thirsted. He could be wearied and pained. In mental stature, too, as in bodily, he passed through the normal human development. 'He increased in wisdom' as 'in stature.' And not only in bodily and mental stature, but in moral and spiritual stature likewise He grew—'in favour with God and man'—a growth and increase dependent, like our own, on conflict and struggle with temptation and sorrow and trial, which He had to meet and overcome just with the same weapons as are at our command, namely, prayer and faithful dependence on God. He wrought 'mighty works,' indeed; but He wrought them, not in His own inherent strength, but by the power of God. 'God anointed him,' said Peter, reflecting the uniform evangelic representation, 'with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him' (Ac 10^{38}).

But now, in His risen exalted state, He has exchanged this, His earthly condition of absolute dependence, for one of absolute sovereignty. He is Lord over all worlds, seen and unseen; 'all power (or authority) given to him in heaven and on earth,' controlling and governing all the forces of the universe for the world's redemption. He, the very Jesus who came to Bethlehem's manger in great humility, He who was a child in the home of Joseph and Mary at Nazareth, who grew in wisdom and stature, who was tempted, tried, scourged, crucified,—He, and not another, is now Lord of all, through his Resurrection and Exaltation become the real and effective Ruler of heaven and earth.

This for Paul—the Resurrection, Exaltation, and Enthronement of Christ—is the supreme illustration and manifestation of 'the exceeding greatness' of the redemptive power of God. The Incarnation—yes, that is wonderful: that it should have been possible for the Eternal Son of God, who 'was in the beginning with God' and 'was God,' Very God of Very God, to descend from the eternal splendours of Divine supremacy and become man, Very Man of Very Man—that is a wonderful, a miraculous manifestation of the power of God placed at the disposal of Holy Love. And that having become man, He should under human conditions live the life He did live—'tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin,' a life, absolutely holy and pure without spot or stain, which He could at last offer to God for us as a perfect sacrifice—that is an even more wonderful and more miraculous illustration and manifestation of the greatness of the power of the Spirit of God. 'Who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God' (He 9^{14}). But that, having become man, and such a Man, He should have been raised, still retaining His humanity, to those heights of authority and glory, and become Ruler and Lord of all for redemptive ends—that is for Paul the greatest wonder of all, the crowning illustration and manifestation of 'the exceeding greatness' of the redemptive energy of God.

III.

But, now, notice the next step—the climax in the Apostle's evangelical argument. This energizing of the power of God, exceeding great, in the Resurrection, Exaltation, and Enthronement of Christ does not stand alone. It is not an end in itself. The chapter and verse divisions of Paul's letter which we have in our Bible, however convenient from the point of view of reference, are often unfortunate as introducing an unintended chasm into the highway of the Apostle's argument. Such in especial is the case here. There is no break in the Apostle's thought corresponding to the division between the two chapters. 'According to that energizing of the might of his strength which he wrought in Christ when he raised him . . . and raised you.' It is but the continuation of the one thought of the exceeding greatness of the power of God made available through Holy Love for redemptive ends. The resurrecting energy of God in raising Christ and in raising us is one and the same. It is the same power, exceeding great, which raised Christ from the dead and exalted Him at God's right hand in the heavenlies, which, says Paul, writing to the members of the Christian Churches of Asia, raised them from the death in which they were and set them with Christ in the heavenlies in newness of life. For they too, he says, were dead—dead not with a merely physical death as Christ was, but worse, morally and spiritually dead, 'dead in trespasses and sins.' That was their condition apart from Christ. And in them, too, hath God manifested His resurrecting energy. 'And you hath he quickened, made

alive, raised from the dead as truly as he quickened and raised Christ from the dead—raised you up together with Christ, and seated you with him in the heavenlies.' The one act is the prolongation of the other, the manifestation in two steps or stages of the same Divine miraculous resurrecting energy. For Christ's Exaltation is no otiose Exaltation. Through it a new redemptive energy of incalculable potency has become available for man. As it has been put: 'He does not merely watch, with a perfect sympathy of joy, the infinite activities of the Divine life and the tremendous manifestations of the Divine power, as a son might watch the successive triumphs of his father's heroism and his father's genius.' He Himself is Lord of all, wielding and governing all the energies of Omnipotent Love for the redemption of those who put their trust in Him. All power has been given to Him in order that, just as He lived His wonderful life of holiness and purity on earth and wrought His wonderful 'works' in the power of the Spirit, so He may now live out and live over again in His people the life that He lived on earth, and in the power of His Resurrection do even greater works than He did then. In a word, the very supernatural energy of the Spirit of God which energized in Jesus, first in His life here on earth, and then in raising Him from the grave,—that is now operative in the world, energizing in His followers to holiness and righteousness of life.

Are there those who tell us to-day in this scientific age, with its dominant ideas of 'law,' of 'immutable law' (falsely so called), and of the 'uniformity of nature,' that the age of miracles is past, and that the need of the time in the sphere of religion is to free the gospel from its association with the miraculous? No, says Paul, that cannot be. As often as sinful men are converted and raised to newness of life in Christ, as often as the Spirit of the living God breathes into a human spirit lying powerless and buried in sin and raises it to newness of life, so often is there as true a miracle, as true a supernatural manifestation of the resurrecting energy of God, as when our Lord came forth from the tomb and went to the Throne. It is contrary to experience—to ordinary experience, that is—that a man should die and be buried and then rise again from the dead as Christ rose. But equally contrary to experience is it that a sinful man, a man dead to his true life in God 'through trespasses and sins,' should be forgiven and raised to newness of life. It is something altogether outside the normal operations of nature and humanity. It is a new departure, 'a new creation,' not in the sense of a disorderly occurrence, as a breach or violation of the natural order, but the manifestation of a higher order or law, 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.' 'If any man is in Christ, there is a new creation; the old things are passed away: behold, they are become new' (2 Co 5^{17}).

This is the perpetual miracle of Christian experience—the miracle of changed lives—and the cessation of miracle in this sense would be the cessation of Christianity as a living religion. As the religion of Redemption, with its message of forgiveness and emancipation from the power of sin through Christ, Christianity is miraculous from beginning to end, the comprehensive miracle of Christian history and experience answering to the comprehensive miracle of the history and experience of Christ—both alike the manifestation of the working of the mighty resurrecting energy of the living God. For the meaning of the Christian gospel is just this, that God, in His infinite grace, has put His Divine Omnipotence at the free play of His redeeming Righteousness and holy Love.

So, then, let us up with our hearts. The hope of our calling—'that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love' (1^{4})—this, which is the contemplated end and issue of all the Divine love-movements towards us, is an attainable reality. Not in our own strength; to think that were the veriest presumption of foolishness. It is a supra-human task, and in the truest sense supra-natural. 'It is high; I cannot attain to it.' But if God is the God we know Him in Christ to be, and if Christ is the Christ we know Him through grace to be, and if the Holy Spirit is the Spirit we know Him through Christian history and experience to be, then it is possible. 'Created in Christ Jesus unto good works' (2^{10}). The supra-natural for us is for God the truly natural. 'With man it is impossible, but not with God: for with God,' the God whose very nature it is to do 'wondrous things,' 'all things are possible.'

As the paraphrase puts it:

> Father of peace, and God of love!
> We own Thy pow'r to save,
> That pow'r by which our Shepherd rose
> Victorious o'er the grave.

A power this is, which is not merely an interesting fact for thought to contemplate, but a power which is made an available reality for practical ends, even for your redemption and mine. Therefore let our prayer be, for ourselves and for our fellow-members of the body of Christ in this and in other congregations, as it was Paul's prayer for the members of the Christian congregations of Asia Minor, that we may come not into a fuller intellectual or 'notional' apprehension of it merely, but into a deeper experience-knowledge of the working of His mighty resurrecting energy in Christ 'to us-ward who believe.'

O may Thy Spirit seal our souls,
And mould them to Thy will,
That our weak hearts no more may stray,
But keep Thy precepts still;

That to perfection's sacred height
We nearer still may rise,
And all we think, and all we do,
Be pleasing in Thine eyes.

And unto Him that is able to do this, and to do 'exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen' ($3^{20f.}$).

Literature.

PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICS.

There is no form of knowledge that we stand more in need of at the present time (after the knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ) than knowledge of the *Principles of Economics*. Under that title a book has been written by Professor Taussig of Harvard, and published by Messrs. Macmillan (2 vols., 17s. net). It is a large book, but it is a readable book—the more readable because it is large. And although it is written for University students, we strongly recommend every labourer and every employer of labour, and every man or woman who has any interest in the problem of industry, to find a copy and work right through it.

For Professor Taussig is not a faddist. He is not even a politician. He does not take the truculent side of labour, nor the supercilious side of employment. He writes scientifically, not by any means standing aloof in Laodicean indifference; sympathizing keenly enough with the difficulties of modern trade and enterprise, but far too well aware of these difficulties and the history of them to suggest that one side is all in the wrong, and the other all in the right. He knows no 'short way' with the employer or 'short way' with the employed, or any other method whatever of obtaining a settlement of trade disputes, than by abundance of knowledge and abundance of forbearance.

Read what he says on distribution. For if you settle the question of distribution, you settle the whole dispute. The crucial question of distribution is that of wages, and there are three conceivable ways of fixing the rate of wages. One way is to decide that every man's income should be alike. This, curiously enough, is called distribution according to *need*. But it will not do, because one man's needs are mostly physical, another man's mainly intellectual, and yet another man's eminently spiritual. The second method suggested is that men should be paid in proportion to the irksomeness of their labour. This is called the principle of *sacrifice*. The objection to it is that sacrifice is a subjective thing, and no two men will agree upon the meaning or value of it. The third principle is that of *efficiency*. Let each man be rewarded in accordance with his contribution to the social income; the strong man gets more, the weak gets less.

These principles are all carefully weighed and balanced by Professor Taussig in his chapter on Socialism. That chapter is itself as unbiassed and authoritative as any in the book. It ought to be read with care throughout; and after it is read, the reader should proceed to master some of the books that are recommended at the end of it. It is one of the merits of Professor Taussig's volumes that after they have given us a dispassionate bird's-eye view of the matter, they name and discriminate the literature that should follow after.

LONDON THEOLOGICAL STUDIES.

London Theological Studies may not be an attractive title, but it is the title of one of the most attractive books of the month. It is the title given to a collection of essays by members of the Faculty of Theology in the University of London, and published for the University of London Press by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (10s. 6d. net). An introductory note by Mr. S. W. Green, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Regent's Park College, gives a sketch of the history of the Faculty. And then come the essays.

It is never possible for a volume of essays of this kind (and we have had many such volumes within the last few years) to cover the whole field of theology. The skill of the editor or editors is discovered in the selection that is made. This volume begins with a paper on the 'Historical Value of the Old Testament' by Dr. W. H. Bennett, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Hackney and New Colleges. It is followed by 'The Yalkut of R. Machir Bar Abba Mari on the Book of Jonah' by Dr. A. W. Greenup, Principal of St. John's Hall, Highbury. This essay occupies the ground between the Old Testament and the New. On the New Testament itself the only paper is one that estimates the 'Significance of the Eschatological Utterances of Jesus.' It is written by Mr. H. T. Andrews, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Hackney and New Colleges. These articles are followed by five papers which are partly theological and partly ecclesiastical. 'Prolegomena to the Study of Theology' is written by Dr. A. C. Headlam, Principal of King's College; 'Christ and the Christian Principle' by Dr. P. T. Forsyth, Principal of Hackney College; 'Continuity throughout the Reformation' by Dr. J. P. Whitney, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College; the 'Authority of Jesus Christ in Early Christian Literature' by Dr. H. H. Scullard, Professor of Church History and Christian Ethics in Hackney and New Colleges; and the 'Holy Spirit and Divine Immanence' by Dr. W. T. Davison, Principal of the Wesleyan College, Richmond. The volume ends with two articles on religion—the 'Study of Religion' by Dr. A. E. Garvie, Principal of New College, and the 'Emotional Element in Religion' by Dr. A. Caldecott, Professor of Moral Philosophy in King's College.

These then are the essays, and these are the men who have written them. The names carry weight, and the subjects are timely. The topics are manifestly chosen, not to leave no corner of theological Christianity unvisited, but rather to show how numerous the interests are and to discuss those that are of most pressing importance.

We had chosen for particular notice the article by Professor Davison on the 'Holy Spirit and Divine Immanence,' being particularly drawn to it on account of the intrinsic importance of the subject and the scholarly, sane, and altogether satisfactory treatment which it has received. But Dr. Davison has already brought his subject within the smallest limits compatible with clearness, so that we have decided to rest content with this short, but emphatic commendation of the whole volume.

THE EARLY ENGLISH DISSENTERS.

From the Cambridge University Press there comes an important work on *The Early English Dissenters*, covering the century from 1550 to 1641 (2 vols., 20s. net). It is the work of an American writer, Mr. Champlin Burrage, who, however, is a B.Litt. of Oxford, for which degree, indeed, this work, or the nucleus of it, was originally proposed as a thesis.

It is good that such a book comes from the Cambridge Press. It is good also that it comes from a man who is neither a dissenter nor an English churchman; a man who has no interest either in the recommendation or in the rejection of nonconformity. It is well to see both sides of a question; it is better to see the two sides combined in one simple intelligible view of the truth.

Moreover, Mr. Burrage has gone to the sources. This claim he makes emphatically. His ideal, he says, has been to rely on secondary evidence as little as possible, and to amplify and correct the studies of earlier writers (including his own previous writings), in the belief that such further critical investigation was absolutely necessary, if the study was ever truly to be understood. The risk which a historian runs who so deliberately sets aside the popular histories is that he will be found unpopular. That risk Mr. Burrage has escaped by producing his work in two volumes, of which the first volume contains the history, the second the sources relied upon. It is, therefore, quite possible to read the history of English dissent in

its first formative century comfortably at the fireside, although it will soon be recognized that Mr. Burrage has no desire to be looked upon as, in the ordinary sense, a popular writer.

The second volume has its own independent value, and it might be a good thing if it were issued separately. It does for dissent what Gee's book does for the Church of England. There is the same careful selection of materials, and there is the same strict accuracy in transcribing them. Mr. Burrage has something like a horror of the historian who professes to quote an ancient author and alters his spelling. We might call it a 'holy horror,' for to him an inaccurate quotation is an active immorality.

THE PEOPLE'S BOOKS.

Messrs. Jack's *People's Books* are the most amazing of all the issues of cheap books which have astonished our day and generation. It used to be said that a cloth binding alone cost about sixpence, so that whatever happened no cloth bound book could be published at that price. But the *People's Books*, which are published at sixpence each, are bound in cloth. Each volume contains about a hundred pages of printed matter. And (most astonishing of all) that printed matter is entirely original. It is the purpose of the publishers to issue no works that have ever been issued before, but to find fresh subjects, and an author to write a fresh book on every subject.

The first twelve volumes are out. Their subjects are Botany, Heredity, Organic Chemistry, the Principles of Electricity, the Science of the Stars, Bergson, Roman Catholicism, Mary Queen of Scots, Women's Suffrage, Shakespeare, a Choice of Lyrics and Sonnets, and Dante. It is a list that will appeal in its entirety to many, while every man will find one or two books in his own particular department of study. The authors are well chosen. Professor Herford writes on Shakespeare, and Mr. Howell on Dante; the Science of the Stars is by Mr. Maunder, and the Study of Botany by Dr. Stopes; Miss O'Neill tells the story of Mary Queen of Scots, and Mrs. Fawcett commends the cause of Women's Suffrage.

It is due to the absorbing interest in social questions which characterizes our thinking to-day that certain theological words which had almost dropped out of the language are coming back again. Such words, we mean, as 'conversion' and 'salvation.' They are coming back no doubt with a somewhat different meaning, but those who read a volume entitled *Jesus Salvator Mundi*, written by the Rev. J. H. Beibitz, M.A., and published by Mr. Edward Arnold (2s. 6d. net), will see that strong and conscious effort is made to retain the old individual value which these words possess, while adding to them a new social connotation. Mr. Beibitz has a chapter on the 'Salvation of Social Life,' but he has also a chapter on the 'Salvation of the Whole Man.' The book contains modestly 'Some Lenten Thoughts on Salvation.' It will be found in reality to offer a comprehensive exposition of that great doctrine marked by finished scholarship throughout.

To live with saints is 'to become either a saint or a devil.' But if the saints are only in a book? It depends upon the book. The Rev. S. A. Alexander, Canon and Treasurer of St. Paul's, preached seven sermons on 'Saints' in St. Paul's Cathedral, and then gathered the sermons into a small book which he has called *The Saints' Appeal* (Arnold; 2s. net). In that little book he brings us into the company of the saints with a most vivid imagination. If the saying that has been quoted does not hold good in all its force, this at least is sure, that we must be either the better or the worse for reading a book which makes so imperative a demand upon our conscience.

One is tempted to say that every student who discovers for himself the truth of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament and its value for faith and life, thinks it his duty to write a book about it. For of late we have had very many popular books expounding the Old Testament according to Criticism. And this simple explanation seems at first quite sufficient to account for a book entitled *The Old Testament*, which has been written by the Rev. H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A. (Arnold; 2s. 6d. net). But further consideration gives distinction to the volume. For Mr. Lanchester has made it his particular object to illustrate the traditions of the Hebrews by those of other lands, and thus to determine as far as possible what their history rests upon, and how it is to be placed in the general history of the ancient East.

Not only so. Mr. Lanchester writes with conviction and with literary ability—just that combination which produces true eloquence. Let any one who is afraid of the effect of the Higher Criticism on the Old Testament read this book, but let no one read it who is afraid of being converted to belief in the Higher Criticism.

What a fascinating study is that of the Synoptic Problem. No doubt every study is fascinating to the man who really enters into it. But the Synoptic Problem is to the uninitiated so utterly uninteresting. It looks like a mathematical exercise in permutations and combinations. One glances over the pages of *An Introduction to the Synoptic Problem*, by the Rev. Eric Rede Buckley, M.A. (Arnold; 5s. net), and finds them sprinkled with separate capital letters, Q, L, T, and the like, and wonders what possible pleasure there can be in their manipulation and what good can come out of it at last. But to the student of the Synoptic Problem the study of the Synoptic Problem is most fascinating, and the good that comes out of it at last is a firm conviction of the truth of the gospel narrative. That conviction has not always come out of this study, but that was because the study was not thorough enough, not scientific enough. Mr. Buckley's Introduction is a book for students. It demands study, but it is by no means so intricate as, for example, Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*. Mr. Buckley has selected his materials with a single eye to simplicity. It is a book which the beginner in the subject may begin with, and yet it will not be lost labour on the part of the scholar to read it, for Mr. Buckley has his own independent opinion on many minor matters, although in the main he agrees with modern scholarship as to the fundamental importance of Q, the priority of St. Mark, and all the rest.

Dr. James Lindsay, who has already written so much and so incisively on the problem of philosophy, shows the breadth of his culture in a book which he has published with the title *New Essays, Literary and Philosophical* (Blackwood; 6s. net). He calls the Essays 'Literary and Philosophical.' At first sight they are only literary, but the topics which are handled in them are not the ordinary literary topics of the magazine column or debating society. They are such difficult subjects as 'The Contribution of Greek Literature to the World's Religious Thought,' 'The Romantic Movement in European Literature,' 'The Italian Poetry of our Time.' And these subjects are handled not at all in the manner of the debating society or monthly magazine, but in a scientific spirit and by a man who has a thorough knowledge of the problems of philosophy and of the attempts, great and small, that have been made to solve them.

No books keep their value better than do books about books, that is to say, bibliographies. Lose no time, therefore. Send for a copy of the *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society*. The first volume was published in 1903. It contained an account of the Bibles printed in English. The second volume has just been published. It contains an account of all the Bibles which have been published by the Bible Society in other languages, and is bound in three separate parts, each part being equal in size to the first volume. Now, the point is that only 500 sets have been printed, of which 450, published and signed, are for sale in England and America. Already the subscription price has been raised to three guineas, and no volume or any part of a volume can be bought by itself. In a short time the price of a copy will be——well, that is what no man can foresee or foretell; for there is nothing more curious in commerce than the way in which books go up and down in price. Balfour's *Foundations of Belief* can be bought for 2s., his *Defence of Philosophic Doubt* cannot be bought for £2.

The science of bibliography has not been well cultivated in this country. But work like that which has been done in the volumes before us by Mr. T. H. Darlow and Mr. H. F. Moule will go a good long way towards removing this national reproach. No industrious German ever showed more industry. The number of items entered in this second volume is enormous, but every item receives the same patient and even loving care. Then the printing surpasses that of the very best German or French work. There is a richness, almost luxuriance, in the beautiful white paper, broad page and ample spacing, and the very type is clean and faultless and of sufficient variety to please the most fastidious taste.

Mr. T. H. Hennessy, M.A., Dean and Lecturer

of Selwyn College, Cambridge, has written the commentary on *The Second Book of Kings* for the 'Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools' (Cambridge University Press; 1s. net). His commentary takes the place of Professor Rawson Lumby's, which was issued in 1891. It is practically a new book, although we see that the publishers speak of it simply as a new edition of Lumby's commentary. The text employed is that of the Authorized Version, but the verses are not made into separate paragraphs as in that version.

From the Clarendon Press there comes a new Commentary on *The Acts of the Apostles* (8s. 6d. net). It is described as 'A Commentary for English Readers,' and its author, the Very Rev. William Mordaunt Furneaux, D.D., Dean of Winchester, has used only works written in English or translated into English. Of these, however, he has used a very long list, and used them freely.

This is not said to suggest that Dr. Furneaux is not original. He *is* original, in matter and in manner. His translation is his own; and his notes are not merely summary explanations of the words of the text, but also explanations of the circumstances, the ideas, and the aims of the writer of the Acts.

The attitude is an independent conservatism. The angel who delivered the apostles from prison in chapter v. is explained away: 'A Hebrew way of describing what we call the action of Providence; and probably what is meant is some Divine intervention by natural means, such as connivance on the part of some official.' But the angel who released Peter in chapter xii. is accepted without misgiving. The story of Ananias and Sapphira creates trouble. Dr. Furneaux concludes that the earlier part, that which describes the judgment on Ananias, is historical; but the later, that which tells the doom of his wife, is unhistorical.

So there is independence enough and interest. Without doubt the English reader will receive help from the book, and not the least part of the benefit he will derive from it will be the demand it deliberately makes upon him that sometimes he should think for himself.

Messrs. Gay & Hancock are the publishers of a small but valuable book on *The Function of the Church in Modern Society* (2s. 6d. net). The author of the book is Dr. W. J. Tucker, President of Dartmouth College, and formerly Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. What is the function of the Church in modern society? It is a double ministry—the ministry of spiritual authority and the ministry of human sympathy. At the present time, says Dr. Tucker, the demand for sympathy is greater than the demand for authority, but the history of the Church proves how weak a thing is sympathy without authority. On the other hand, the same history proves, by too frequent illustration, how empty a thing is authority without sympathy. Dr. Tucker's purpose, therefore, is to urge upon the Church the resumption of that spiritual authority which has been in a measure suspended during the recent period of theological construction, and to urge no less the return to that sympathetic concern in human interests, that fellow-feeling with men, the absence of which at certain points has caused so much alienation from the Church.

That indefatigable worker and enthusiastic student of the Bible, Professor A. T. Robertson of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, has issued another volume this month. Its subject is John the Baptist; its title *John the Loyal* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s.).

We believe that this is the kind of work which Dr. Robertson does best. It demands scholarship and imagination, and he has both. He has both, and he makes the one watch the other. The imagination does not glorify the facts out of all recognition; and the facts do not flatten the imagination out of all endurance. In the end of the volume there is a list of remunerative works on John the Baptist. To that list add now *John the Loyal.*

Professor Peake has finished the second volume of his Commentary on Jeremiah for the Century Bible. This brings the Century Bible very near the end. The volume on Daniel by Professor Charles is the only volume still wanting. The present volume includes Lamentations, the title being *Jeremiah and Lamentations* (Jack; 2s. 6d. net). And we are particularly glad to have a new commentary on Lamentations from so wise a scholar as Professor Peake. It is a book with which very little is done in the pulpit, and consequently it is neglected in a way that used to make

Professor A. B. Davidson utter an occasional emphatic protest. Were it for nothing else than its intense burning patriotism, it deserves to be read and recommended in these days. Professor Peake believes that the second and fourth chapters of the Book were written by one who was an eye-witness of the 'horrors of Judah's last agony,' and who, like Ezekiel, was at the time of writing an exile in Babylonia. The third chapter he looks upon as much later, while the first, he thinks, may belong to the same period as the second and fourth. He places the fifth chapter near the close of the Exile. At the same time he admits the force of Dr. Selbie's argument in the *Dictionary of the Bible* that the whole Book is later than the Exile, an argument which has recently received the support of Mr. C. J. Ball in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

The Jewish Year-Book for the year 5672–5673, which means 1912, is out (Office of the *Jewish Chronicle*; 1s. net), full of facts and figures, all skilfully arranged and accessible. Among the rest of its contents it furnishes a Jewish 'Who's Who' and a classified list of books on all subjects in which Jews have an interest.

Mr. Edward J. Brailsford has published some meditations which he has made on 'morning mysteries,' with the title *Thoughts at Sunrise* (Kelly; 1s. net). There is, for example, a meditation on this text—'And the angel came again, and waked me, as a man that is wakened out of his sleep.' Have you ever preached on that text? Read this meditation before you do; it will be profitable to preach on it then.

Not long ago Dr. Joseph Agar Beet wrote an introduction to the study of the New Testament. He has now written an introduction to the study of the Old. Its title is *The Old Testament, its Contents, Truth and Worth* (Kelly; 2s. net). The book is easily read, and its meaning is always unmistakable. As an experienced commentator, Dr. Beet rejects the manner of the Levite when he meets a difficulty—the Levite who 'came to the place, and saw him, and passed by on the other side.' And there are difficulties enough in the Old Testament now. But Dr. Beet does more with a difficulty than discuss it. He shows how it is related to other facts and ideas. In this way he enables us to see that Inspiration, for example, is not to be *defined* as formerly. It is not a matter that is touched by the discovery of a mistake in figures. It does not involve infallibility. 'All inward help from the spirit of God may justly be called inspiration. For it is a work of God in us, by His Spirit, enabling us to understand and do what otherwise would be beyond our knowledge and power.' In this way the book, small and popular as it is, will prepare the way for a more critical and yet constructive understanding of the Old Testament on the part of teachers of young people. Until the teacher adopts the right interpretation, the preacher will take it for granted in vain or even perhaps at his peril.

Messrs. Longmans have re-published the sermon on the 'Sorrow of the World,' together with the introductory essay on 'Accidie' from the late Bishop Paget's volume *The Spirit of Discipline*. The new volume containing these two is entitled *The Sorrow of the World* (2s. net). The two go well together. The essay on 'Accidie' is the classic discussion of the subject outside the literature of Roman Catholicism.

What is Christianity? Dr. S. D. M'Connell gives *his* answer in *Christianity, an Interpretation* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). Dr. M'Connell's answer proceeds in the opposite way from Professor Harnack's. He begins by rejecting all the things which, in his opinion, do not belong to Christianity—the Fall, the Atonement, and certain other doctrines; and he rejects them emphatically. That any sane man could ever have supposed them to be part of Christianity renders him speechless with astonishment.

Then he affirms the doctrines of the Resurrection and the Divine Sonship, salvation by faith and everlasting joy; and even restores in another form the very doctrines which at the beginning he so resolutely cast away. It is just the opposite way from Harnack, who at first seemed to admit everything and in the end left us with next to nothing. But Dr. M'Connell has a steadier hand than Harnack.

The Army of God is the title which Mrs. S. B. Macy has given to her story of the Church during the first six centuries, written for children (Long-

mans; 3s. 6d. net). It is a handsome and well-illustrated quarto volume. How very little do children know about the history of the Church. Will Mrs. Macy succeed in making it attractive to them?

In writing his Devotional Commentary on the 51st Psalm, which he has published under the title of *The Sacrament of Repentance* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net), the Ven. James H. F. Peile, Archdeacon of Warwick, has used the text of the Prayer-Book version, which is a pardonable offence, though a pity. It is a pardonable offence, because that version is so familiar to him, and an unfamiliar version would lend itself less readily to devotion. Yet it is a pity, because here and there a mistranslation sends him off the line. Strictly observing his purpose not to touch questions critical, Mr. Peile accepts the Davidic authorship of the Psalm, and the story of Uriah the Hittite as the occasion of it.

The Rev. F. Ernest Spencer, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Haggerston, has written *A Short Introduction to the Old Testament* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). His reason for writing another introduction to the Old Testament—for we have had not a few of late—is that his position is somewhat peculiar, and he wants to make his peculiar position appreciated so that it may be no longer peculiar. He is a higher critic, but he is not a follower of Wellhausen. He holds that the compiler or compilers of the Hexateuch used documents that were already in existence, as all the higher critics hold; but he differs from other higher critics in holding that these documents were all contemporaneous with the event which they record. For trustworthy evidence, then, you may pin your faith to P, just as readily as to J. If there is a difference between them, it is only that the one deals with one class of facts and the other with another. He uses the following illustration:—'J. E. and P. are elements of all serious history, and there was an editor, who combined sources. For instance, in the story of our own Alfred the Great, the war stories and the burning of the cakes is the J. E., and the translation of books, the institution of a navy, the measuring of time is the P. But I do not see the slightest reason for doubting the contemporary value of either.'

What does this come to? It comes to this, that Mr. Spencer accepts the higher criticism so far as it is literary, and rejects it so far as it is historical; and as the literary criticism is only a means to an end, the end being the historical criticism, Mr. Spencer really rejects that reconstruction of the Old Testament which has absorbed the scholarship of our day.

The President of Bowdoin College, Dr. W. De Witt Hyde, is as a writer well known in this country and much appreciated. His new book *The Five Great Philosophies of Life* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net) will at once command attention. What are the five great philosophies? They are the Epicurean pursuit of pleasure, the Stoic self-control by law, the Platonic subordination of lower to higher, the Aristotelian sense of proportion, and the Christian spirit of love. The discussion of the first four is more effective than the discussion of the last. The chapter on Love is not concentrated enough. Many good things are said about Christian love, but not in such a way that its pressure is felt or its uplift experienced. It is unusual for Dr. Hyde to be so discursive. What is the reason of it? Is it that he has really mistaken the essential thing in Christianity? Is the essential thing love? Is it not life?

But in spite of this measure of discursiveness in the last chapter, the book is one that will be both read and remembered. It deals with those fundamental things of *choice* that are so much with us to-day.

Lack of missionary interest is largely lack of imagination. What we have not seen we cannot realize. But much may be done by information. Only the information must be of the right kind and offered in an acceptable form.

Suppose, for example, that we really want to take an interest in the Melanesian Mission. The best way is to visit Melanesia, and stay a few days on Meralava or some other of the Banks Islands, 'where every prospect pleases' and man is no longer vile. Another way is to come in contact with some Melanesian missionary and henceforth think at least of *him*. But the most easy and a quite effective way is to obtain a copy of Miss Florence Coombe's *Islands of Enchantment* (Macmillan; 12s. net). In that book there is a description of almost all the Melanesian Islands, a description that is due partly to eyesight, partly

to the reading of other books, a description that, however it is obtained, is always lifelike and attractive. And if the imagination still needs encouragement, there are the illustrations, of which the book is full—illustrations of scenes and people, all cleverly selected and capably photographed.

But there is more in the book than the missionary interest. There is the interest of Religion and Folklore. Miss Coombe describes the native customs and transcribes the native legends. For the purpose of furnishing a first acquaintance with this multifarious race there is no better book.

'The praying which makes a prayerful ministry is not a little praying put in as we put flavour to give it a pleasant smack, but the praying must be in the body, and form the blood and bones. Prayer is no petty duty, put into a corner; no piecemeal performance made out of the fragments of time which have been snatched from business and other engagements of life; but it means that the best of our time, the heart of our time and strength must be given. It does not mean the closet absorbed in the study or swallowed up in the activities of ministerial duties; but it means the closet first, the study and activities second, both study and activities freshened and made efficient by the closet. Prayer that affects one's ministry must give tone to one's life. The praying which gives colour and bent to character is no pleasant hurried pastime. It must enter as strongly into the heart and life as Christ's "strong crying and tears" did; must draw out the soul into an agony of desire as Paul's did; must be an inwrought fire and force like the "effectual, fervent prayer" of James; must be of that quality which when put into the golden censer and incensed before God, works mighty spiritual throes and revolutions.'

The paragraph just quoted will furnish some notion of the purpose which Mr. E. M. Bounds has set before him in writing his book called *Power Through Prayer* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d.).

Mr. A. Crighton Alexander has had three pastorates—at Douglas, Stoke Newington, and Saline, and at each pastorate, as well as out of the circumstances of each pastorate, he has written certain poems. Now these poems are gathered together and published under the title of *Poems of Three Pastorates* (Melrose). The last poem of all is a fair example of the whole, it is a paraphrase of the last verse of the 119th Psalm:

'I like a lost sheep went astray;
Thy servant seek and find.'
Is this the man who sought the Lord
With all his heart and mind,
And sang at first the blessedness
Of those to good inclined?

Is this the man who longed so much
For guidance in the way,
Who panted for the Law of God
And purposed to obey?
Whose prayers are ended—in the cry
Of one who went astray!

Is this the man to whom the Word
Was better far than gold,
And who was wiser than his foes
And all the men of old?
Who now bewails his foolishness,
A wanderer from the fold?

'I saw transgressors and was grieved,'
But when, with clearer light,
He sees how he himself has erred,
It is a sadder sight.
'I like a lost sheep went astray'—
The man who knew the right.

But from his grief is wisdom gained
The Ancients did not know—
The saving knowledge of himself,
That makes the saint forgo
The boasting of the Pharisee,
And kneel with sinners low.

If blessèd be the undefiled,
Yet blessèd too are they
Who see how soiled their lives have been,
By wandering from the way,
And turn in penitence to God,
No more to go astray.

And fitly ends our longest psalm
When, treasuring in our mind
The word of truth, we humbly cry:
O Shepherd, good and kind,
We all like sheep have gone astray,
But seek us, Lord, and find.

Miss Mary E. Shipley has now issued the third and last volume of *An English Church History for Children* (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net). The success of the two volumes which preceded it goes some way towards proving that this volume will also be successful. But it is by far the most difficult volume of the three to write. And her readers, even if they all belong to the Church of England, which would be a pity, and even if they are all children, which is most unlikely, will not be expected to receive every fact and its colouring without consideration. No reader, however, old or young, will be able to say that a single statement has been made of mere prejudice, nor once that loyalty to the Church of England means disloyalty to the Church of Christ.

Children of the Resurrection is the happy title which has been given to a series of short papers on our Lord's intimate friends, which were contributed to the *Sunday Magazine* by the late Dr. John Watson (Nisbet; 2s. net, in leather 3s. net). Dr. Watson was always best when he was most simply devotional. This book is the simplicity of devotion throughout.

Pictures in the Book of Acts is the title of a nicely printed and outwardly altogether attractive commentary on the Acts of the Apostles written by David Anderson-Berry, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S. (Glasgow: Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net). The commentary itself will be read with much pleasure by those, and they are not a few, who delight in eloquence. Take a paragraph:—

'Thus unknown the King of Glory rides on His way whilst the multitudes pursue their course; and the frowning portal looks down in stony silence on all this evanescent clamour of many tongues and swallows up the shouting throngs in its Cimmerian Night to emerge another day when He Who rides the cynosure of adoring eyes then shall walk all gory to Golgotha, and they who vie in shouting "Hosanna—O Save!" the loudest shall cry, "Away with Him! Away with Him!"'

The new volume of the Oxford Church Textbooks is an exposition of *The Athanasian Creed* (Rivingtons; 1s. net), by the Rev. A. E. Burn, D.D., Vicar of Halifax and Prebendary of Lichfield. The editor of the series had no hesitation in offering this subject to Dr. Burn. Dr. Burn's previous studies marked him out as the man in the Church of England to receive the first offer of it, and he has given himself to the work with as much care and conscience as though it were great enough to make a reputation by. In reality, his book is not so large as an ordinary encyclopædia article, but just like ordinary encyclopædia articles it has the matter of a great book packed conveniently and comfortably into it.

Canon Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible* has never been superseded. Parts of the ground have been covered by other writers, some of whom have written more fully and have had access to more recent information. But Tristram's is the only book that covers the whole ground scientifically. And we are thankful that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has issued another reprint of it on good paper and in a handsome binding (5s.).

In offering a new exposition of the Beatitudes, under the title of *Heart Cures* (Elliot Stock; 2s. 6d. net), the Rev. Hugh Callan, M.A., F.R.S.G.S., wisely makes no apology for adding to the pile of books on his subject, but (again wisely) writes an introduction in which he states his method of approach. The point, he says, is to notice that in the Kingdom it is not position that counts, but disposition. He is right. For why was the Pharisee not merciful and meek? Because his *attitude* to God was wrong. Get him into the right attitude, the attitude of the publican, 'God be merciful to me, the sinner,' and the right disposition will follow. Thus Mr. Callan is on proper lines. It is not poverty that is blessed, it is poverty that is rich toward God.

Evangelism, like everything else, must now be social. But the Rev. David Lindsay, who has published a book on *Social Evangelism* (Stockwell), recognizes without any reserve that the individual himself must be evangelized before social evangelism can begin. His clearest, keenest chapter is on conversion; his deepest sorrow that we do not expect conversions now, and have even ceased to believe in them.

If Mr. James Thin of Edinburgh would furnish a few more texts for the use of students similar to that which he has published under the title of

Greek Christian Literature, students would be his debtors thankfully. This small volume contains the Apologies of Quadratus and Aristides, the Epistle to Diognetus, and the Didache. The selection has been made by Dr. Bruce McEwen of the University of Edinburgh. The text has been carefully corrected throughout.

To the study of Robert Browning, which is yet in its infancy, Professor Thomas R. Lounsbury, L.H.D., LL.D., of Yale, has made a notable contribution. It will not be acceptable to those who practise idolatry with Browning. For there is criticism in it, and sometimes sharp criticism. There is criticism of Browning's poetry, and there is criticism of Browning himself.

But what is the book? It is a study of *The Early Literary Career of Robert Browning* (Fisher Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). Now it is the early career that is puzzling. Why was there so much hesitation in recognizing this man's genius? And why are there so many contradictions and questions of fact in respect of his life and work? Professor Lounsbury corrects many mistakes that have been made, solves difficulties, and reconciles contradictions. And especially he gives us clearly to understand why the recognition was delayed so long—or rather why it came, and then departed for a time. Yes, it is a notable contribution to Browning literature.

The Rev. E. J. Hardy, M.A., who will still be recognized as the author of the sensational book *How to be Happy though Married*, has been travelling in what has been called the Near East. And he has had his Bible with him on his travels. And now, under the title of *The Unvarying East* (Fisher Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), he has published a book which may not make the sensation of his first volume, but which ought to be very popular; a book in which he has given an account of the scenes he has visited and of the passages in the Bible which he has found illustrated by these scenes. It is a book of illustration more than of exposition, and contains plenty of anecdotes, old and new, Western as well as Eastern. Scenes, incidents, and anecdotes are brought together in chapters under such heads as Agriculture, Beasts and Birds, Business, Celebrated Cities, and the like, an arrangement which has made the scientific value of the book more than it would otherwise have been, and takes nothing away from its pleasantness.

The Message of Rudolf Eucken.

By the Rev. J. Dick Fleming, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, and Lecturer in Philosophy, Manitoba College, Winnipeg.[1]

II.

As we have seen, Eucken's new metaphysical principle is that there is a realm of spirit, a real independent spiritual reality, not the product of the natural man, but communicating itself to him as the deeper reality of himself and the totality of nature. 'That a new totality of life, a primary creative power fashioning the world, makes its presence known to us—this is the cardinal principle on the attainment and vivid realization of which all truth of thought and life depends.' This eternal spiritual world, in which we increasingly participate, is the inward invisible soul of things that penetrates and sustains the visible; it is the deeper reality of which nature is but the surface, or prophecy.

To some this cardinal thesis of Eucken will be too vague to be intelligible; to others it may be startling as a bolt from the blue. I cannot here explain the philosophical connexion of this view of spiritual reality with Plato and Plotinus, with Kant's doctrine of phenomenal nature, with other activistic theories, and particularly with Green's doctrine of an eternal consciousness realizing itself in the human soul under time conditions. I must

[1] The following corrections should be made in the first part of this paper:—P. 249[b], l. 18, 'mankind' for 'manhood'; l. 3 (from bot.), 'proved' for 'placed'; p. 250[b], l. 13 (from bot.), 'depreciating' for 'deprecating'; l. 7, 'attitudes' for 'altitudes'; p. 251[a], l. 15, 'immanent' for 'Immanuel.'

be content to show how Eucken applies it in various spheres; for, after all, the value of such a view will depend on its power to explain and justify the nobler conceptions of life, and to unify the facts.

We are specially interested here in his application of this positive idealism to the problem of religion.

In its classical epochs, religion has always shown itself as an immense propelling power in human life, lifting men to a higher, supernatural world of the spirit, and so transforming and renewing the worldly relations. Spurred on by life's contradiction and unrest men have sought to lay hold of a deeper life in fellowship with the Divine. Religion has always stood for a negation of the finite, and a new affirmation of deeper spiritual reality. It has thus created a reversal of all life's values; and consequently it has either been accepted with deepest conviction, or has awakened the most lively opposition; bringing, therefore, not peace but a sword. This is most clearly seen in Christianity, the religion of religions, where we have a deeper negation of man's natural life as one of weakness and frailty and sin, and at the same time a more strenuous affirmation of rest and blessedness in God. But the history of its progress reveals the problem of religion—how, namely, to realize the Divine life under temporal conditions, without destroying the time-values and without curtailing the spiritual life. We know that the problem was not solved by the Church of the Middle Ages. There we see, on the one hand, the Christian monk giving up the problem in despair and retiring within himself to a life utterly weak and ineffective; and, on the other hand, the Christian ecclesiastic dragging down heaven to earth, clothing his faith in anthropomorphic and mythological forms and dogmas, and materializing the spiritual till it is lost in the magical. How pettily human are the prevailing conceptions of God! how sensuous the ideas of reward and punishment, of purgatory, heaven, and hell! What a strange combination of other-worldliness and worldliness, in which the truly spiritual and Divine are well-nigh extinguished! Nor did the Reformation solve the problem: it was too much under the dominion of the system it condemned to distinguish clearly what was substantial. And modern life has, largely because of this failure, turned to independent paths. We can see this practical dissolution of faith in the earlier Deistic systems which set God outside of the world of nature, or in a Pantheism which only found a place for God by identifying Him with nature, and finally in the present-day naturalism which finds no place for God at all, but sets forth nature in its bareness as the only infinite reality with which we have to do. As we have seen, such a standpoint cannot be finally accepted; indeed, it only appears tolerable because it clothes its nakedness with high-sounding phrases about the progress of humanity, or the elevating power of reason; because it clothes itself with confused thoughts, borrowed (so far as they have a meaning) from the very religion it decries. But that does not imply that we are to go back to the past, and rejecting the truth on which realism stands, to put on the old garments of an effete faith. The time rather calls for a new attitude to life, in which what is true in realism shall have its place, and for a revival of what is substantial in Christianity in forms appropriate to present-day life. 'Religion will never win the indispensable simplicity, the victorious power of conviction necessary, if it does not speak to us in the thought, feeling, and even language of our time, but binds the present inflexibly to the past. When much in the old forms of religion has become to us anthropomorphic, or even mythological and magical, can we shut our eyes to the fact; dare we do so in the true interest of religion?' The Christian world is fighting to-day a losing battle, just because it has pitifully failed to distinguish the substance of religion from its temporal forms, and indeed often put the forms in place of the substance. It does so when it attributes an unchanging Divine value to its doctrines and practices, and puts the Divine life of the spirit in the second place. It does so when it acts on the principle that doctrine or intellectual creed is the basis of Christianity, and so the basis of the Church. It does so when it proclaims that it possesses the final expression of truth—as though such finality were attainable by man. By such anachronisms the Christian Church is standing in the way of its own progress, is concealing the real absolute virtue that lies in it. What is the true kernel of Christianity? It is a life redeemed and renewed; it is the welling up within man of a new depth of spiritual life, which liberates him in the measure he enters into it from the evil and sin of the world, and ennobles his entire life-interests. This spiritual life is no product of nature, or the natural man with his likes and dislikes, but the emergence of a new Divine spiritual reality in

him—a reality that is both fact and task; fact in so far as it represents eternal reality, and task in so far as it has to be more and more completely assimilated. Why is this not recognized? Because we are still bowing down to the worship of idols—the worship of forms and doctrines that are at best the outgrowths of religion, and so of secondary value. And it will surely help us in the modern problem of extracting the substance from the old forms, if we make it clear to ourselves that the spiritual life in all its forms is no mere private matter, but the true influx of a higher reality into our life; and if against the superficial realism which holds to the immediate realities we present this spirit-life as the deeper reality of which nature is but the veil.

And not only will this new conception of spiritual realism enable us to discriminate between substance and form in religion, but it will enable us to transcend the petty anthropomorphisms in the conception of God, which prevent religion from exercising its full power in modern times. The common conception of God as an external Creator, a particular person with attributes of the merely human kind, can scarcely be justified from the modern standpoint, which interprets nature from within, and so is bound to regard such anthropomorphism as mere mythology. It is true that the same scientific type of mind equally regards the spirit-life in man as a mere shadowy reflexion of what is material and sensible. But it is here that we can take our stand. Instead of wasting our strength in defending conceptions that we all recognize more or less to be mythological and childish, we can take our stand on the independent reality of the spirit-life as the very substance of all reality, and as the presupposition of science itself no less than of morality and religion. The particularity of being we ascribe to God when we speak of His personality corresponds to the particularity or petty human side of our own life, which it is the very object of religion to enable us to transcend. The more we find our true life in the world of spirit, the less we consider the merely human and individual side of our life, and the more we become one with the totality of the life of spirit. In other words, if we use personality in the common sense, then the religious life is the entrance into an impersonal, a self-denying life. If we still apply the conception of personality to God, we must attach some higher meaning to personality, and think of God as the perfect concentration and fruition of that spiritual life, which also finds partial concentration in our lives, so far as they are lifted above the mere particular into the universal life of the spirit. If the religious life implies the losing of our petty selfhood in God, why should we ascribe this petty selfhood to God Himself? Eucken admits, indeed, that those who have the Divine within them will necessarily ascribe a centre of personal life to the source from which their life springs. In general, however, it seems best to define God, as the absolute life of spirit, the transcendent self-sufficing spiritual life that is the foundation of all reality—the life in which we ourselves share in the measure that we rise by our decision and our activity above the merely human and natural interests. From this standpoint, too, the problem of God's transcendence or immanence, between which we stand hesitating to-day, will receive its true solution. For the Divine spiritual life assuredly transcends nature and is superior to the world, and yet is active as the basal reality of the world itself, and finds growing realization in us; and so the long debate between dualism and monism is solved.

Eucken applies the same conception to morality, art, science, politics—to all the different spheres of life, and tries to show how it serves to co-ordinate all the departments of life, and reveals a unity of striving within all the diversity. It must suffice here to show how, as he claims, his view serves to unite the truth and to save us from the error of the various types of present-day life which he has already analyzed. It will conserve the substantial truth of the old religious standpoint, and yet readily harmonize with all the veritable achievement of modern science, and so will set religions on a broader and more assured basis. It can recognize the truth that lies in naturalism and in the socialistic standpoint, in so far as they emphasize that man's problem lies here, and not in an imaginary other world; but, on the other hand, it will call us to contend earnestly for the deeper spiritual values. And, again, this positive idealism stands so far side by side with the old idealism in its elevation of spirit above nature. But whereas the old idealism tones down the distinction it has made by its optimistic view of nature as entirely subservient to spirit, the new idealism will side rather with the religious point of view in asserting more firmly the opposition between the natural and the spiritual.

Nature is not simply, as the optimist thinks, the pure and undiluted manifestation of the spiritual and rational. The evil of the world is not solved by a few fine phrases—as when it is said that if we could place ourselves at some higher standpoint, we should see that all was very good. We do not stand at that high altitude, and neither does the optimist; and we cannot accept such hypothetical imaginations as reality. Neither religion nor philosophy has solved the enigma of evil, as it stands in the double question, 'If God is, whence the evil; and if God is not, whence the good?' The only solution possible is the practical one—leaving the negation standing, to press on to the deeper affirmation—namely, that beneath this world of nature there is the deeper reality of the spirit, which is able to lead us on to a triumphant and inexhaustible life. That some problems are declared to be at present unsolvable is quite in accordance with the activistic faith which Eucken holds. For if the mental life is but one aspect of the whole movement of the spirit, and that is a continuous and progressive movement of assimilation of the Divine, no absolute philosophy can be attained. 'Since,' he says, 'since in the end the truth of thought depends on the essential content of life, thought must get rid of the idea that at a given moment it can reach conclusions that are final for all time. Though it must necessarily insist on a truth which transcends time and possesses absolute stability, the stability of this truth does not lie in man, but in the spiritual life itself; and if man, as grounded in the spiritual life, must in some way or other participate in this truth, to work it out to a complete possession is a high goal to which we can only slowly approximate.'

But enough has been said to show the fundamental positions of Eucken's philosophy. His main constructive position lies in his positive idealism, in his conception of the life of spirit, as not a mere secondary product of nature, or even of human effort, but as the universal underlying ground of reality, the spirit-heaven in which we share in our science and art and philosophy and all genuine work, and still more profoundly share in our religious life. Whether we accept the position or not, Eucken must be recognized to have brought together and co-ordinated under his leading principle many aspects of truth. In philosophy he explains by it the apparently *a priori* element of knowledge, and solves the long controversy between rationalist and empiricist; in ethics he finds a new light cast by his principle on freedom, and what idealist ethics calls the 'universal self'; while in religion he finds the principle most fruitful in ridding the life of faith of hampering traditions, and setting it on a new and stronger basis.

The other fundamental view lies in the activistic doctrine that runs through all his writings—the general view, namely, that it is not our philosophical or theological doctrine that determines the life, but the life that determines the doctrine. The intellect has to take a more modest place than it has hitherto occupied; it must stand not apart or above the other movements of life, but side by side with the rest. Reason is no isolated factor, working in a region abstracted from the other life-activities; wherever it is productive of new truth, it is conditioned by the movement of life as a whole. As Eucken puts it: 'Thought gets its determinate character, its clear aims and sure methods from the whole of life. It is conditioned by life's movement and progress; and all hope of advance rests on the hope of a further deepening of life, the awakening of new powers. It is not the mere knowing, but the movement of the whole life which renders progress possible. It is true, however, that this life includes knowledge; it is not a life opposed to knowledge, and appealing (as the Pragmatist thinks) to supposed practical needs in opposition to it.' This activism is not a new doctrine so far as theology is concerned; we all know to-day that theology is the outcome of the religious life, and not its foundation. But Eucken applies the same thought to philosophy, and in his exposition of philosophical systems he shows how everywhere a true philosophy has been the expression of the life of the philosopher, and also of the life and spirit of his age. And he applies it to theology far more thoroughly than we are generally disposed to do. We think that we have adopted the principle that Christian doctrines are the outflow, and not the originating spring of the Christian life; but, in fact, intellectualism in preaching widely reigns. Dr. Hatch's Hibbert Lectures on the Influence of Greece on the Christian Church are devoted to prove this very point. When we imagine that eloquent rhetoric is going to save men's souls, or that the basis of conversion lies in some intellectual dogma; when we make more of intellectual assent than of moral earnestness; when

we put belief in Christ's Divinity above practical fellowship with His Divine Spirit, or belief in the Atonement above the power of the Cross; or when we insist on uniformity of doctrine as essential to the unity of a Church; when we thus emphasize belief rather than life, and doctrine more than reality,—we are chargeable with intellectualism and hiding Christianity behind a screen. And while Eucken would hardly admit Dr. Hatch's assumption as to the valuelessness of metaphysics, he would, I think, agree with him in his final word: 'Though you may believe that I am but a dreamer of dreams, I seem to see—though it be on the far horizon—the horizon beyond the fields which either we or our children will tread—a Christianity which is not new but old, which is not old but new; a Christianity in which the moral and spiritual elements will again hold their place, in which men will be bound together by the bond of mutual service, which is the bond of the sons of God; a Christianity which will actually realize the brotherhood of man, the ideal of its first communities.'

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

From the House Beautiful to the House of Gaius.

In this section Bunyan appears to have tired of the elaborate and artificial style which has disappointed the reader of the earlier pages of this part. He falls back on his own mother-wit again, and the writing is both natural and good. Part of the reason for this may be found in the fact that here the interest again centres round characters rather than curious incidents, and so brings the author back to human nature, where he is always most at home. A striking and beautiful example of the combination of the two centres of interest is found in the description of the Valley of Humiliation, which stands by itself as one of his masterpieces.

The Curiosities of the House Beautiful.

We have still a little time to linger among such quaint fancies as those to which we have already become accustomed, before we take the road again and reach the more strenuous thought.

1. *Eve's apple*—that curiosity that has cost so dear—is first shown. Much has been debated about the moral quality of knowledge, from the days of the Prometheus legend down to Marlowe's and Goethe's *Faust*. Christiana little knows how long a controversy she is epitomizing in her little sentence, 'Food or poison, I know not which.' The mere moralist and preacher would have been so impressed with the importance of knowing sin when one sees it, that he would have drawn a different remark from this good woman. But the humanist in John Bunyan, here or elsewhere, guides him to the exact and universal truth of human nature. Only, some touch of Puritan conscience apparently insists upon the side-note, 'A sight of sin is amazing,' lest the reader might be led to share Christiana's doubt.

2. *Jacob's ladder* is the next sight, with the side-note, 'A sight of Christ is taking.' No further explanation is given, which might explain the connexion between Christ and the ladder. Nor is any needed, for the limestone terraces of the Bethel hills, which presented so long ago this great gift to the religious imagination of the world, told of a connexion between earth and heaven. But that which assured the connexion and established it eternally for man was the Incarnation and the humanity of Jesus Christ. This seems to have been in His own mind when He told Nathanael that 'Henceforth ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man.' It was an aspect of the Saviour which was peculiarly congenial to John Bunyan. Apart from its bright appeal to fancy, it illustrates his delight in all devices for getting from earth to heaven. It is like one of those perplexing impulses, 'sudden to start

off crosswise, not straight on,' which Karshish noted in Lazarus. Pilgrims are often footsore, and their weary hearts may well indulge themselves for an hour now and then with the vision of an immediate entrance to the heavenly land.

3. *The golden anchor* of hope is not a curiosity merely. They are told to take it down and carry it with them. Every imaginable confusion has entered into this metaphor. Gold is not a good metal for the strain of moorings. A golden anchor, large enough to hold in turbulent weather, would have been a burden for Christiana many times heavier than Christian's. And, finally, the whole figure is applicable only to the sea, and has no relevance at all for such an inland voyage as theirs. It is seldom that Bunyan so completely casts consistency to the winds; but when he does so, he does not apologize. He counts upon the understanding of his reader. The passage reminds us of that beautiful incident[1] which Stevenson tells of old Captain Jenkins' trophy to be hung in his dining-room: 'I want you to work me something, Annie. An anchor at each side — an anchor — stands for an old sailor, you know — stands for hope, you know—an anchor at each side, and in the middle THANKFUL.' There are two kinds of hope. There is false hope, which is the result merely of will and desire on the part of the spirit—like a cannon-ball ricochetting over the surface of the sea, only to sink when the initial impulse has failed. The true hope depends on no such impulse; it is a thing which lays hold on hidden facts, and owes its value to their reality and stability.

4. *Relics of Abraham* are shown them; very realistic the list is, with its 'altar, wood, fire, and knife,' not to speak of the mountain itself. Bunyan cares as little for possible misconstruction of his introduction of relics as we found him caring for such misunderstanding as to the Cross.[2] The lesson of Abraham's life is its record of love and self-denial coming down to Christian pilgrims from the grey dawn of history. These are the eternal things amid the fleeting shows of earthly life.

The visit to the House Beautiful ends with music, of which there is so much in Part II. Prudence sings to the accompaniment of the virginals, and we can only hope that the music is better art than the words.

[1] Cf. the writer's *Faith of Robert Louis Stevenson*, p. 245.

[2] For an interesting account of the subject of relics, cf. Lecky, *History of Rationalism*, vol. i. 197, 216.

The Story of the Way.

Great-heart returns, with gifts of food and drink, and his coming is like that of Kyd and Marlowe, the Elizabethan dramatists, who brought in the sense of stern reality and Titanic conflict to an age which had been amusing itself with the Pastorals of Lyly. The departure is marked by some rather grotesque incidents. The Porter receives his gold angel (which Christiana refers to as a 'small mite'), and acknowledges it in a somewhat Oriental fashion. If this man stands for an aspect of the Christian minister, it is certainly a very different aspect from that which Great-heart symbolizes. The incident of the birds which sing verses of psalms[3] in the grove, reminds us of the *Bestiaries* and other French Romances of an earlier century. The mention of Hercules, too, in the speech about Christian has a similar suggestion. But there is a human touch in Prudence's saying, that 'they are very fine company for us when we are melancholy.' We had not imagined that they were ever melancholy in the House Beautiful. And yet there, too, they are human, after all. A 'scheme' is also put into the hands of the pilgrims, for the Church tends towards organization and schemes. There is no possible scheme of the Interpreter's House, and the things we may see there.

The Valley of Humiliation appears utterly different from what Christian found it to be. Here it is a happy, healthy, and delicately beautiful place, 'beautified with lilies,' like the Land of Beulah. The whole description of it is in Bunyan's most exquisite and idyllic style, and its beauty is enhanced by the introduction of the passage describing the scene of Christian's battle with Apollyon—terse, grim, and virile. Altogether, this is one of the most perfect literary achievements of the whole book. Monuments are frequent in Part II.,[4] and here we find one erected to the memory of Christian's fight. They give the sense of history to the allegory, and project behind present spiritual experience a consciousness of the past which is of the greatest value. The 'named houses' of old cities, and the 'speaking stones' of many a mountain and moor, are silent but eloquent appeals to the new generation to play the man like their fathers.

[3] Cf. note upon versions of the Psalms, in the previous article of this series.

[4] Cf. *The Road*, i. p. 156.

Perhaps the sweetest touch in all this region is that of the shepherd boy with his verses, which have long been classical. For the sentiment, it is curious to recall the fact that in these same times Butler had written in his *Hudibras*:

> I am not now in Fortune's power.
> He that is down can fall no lower.

In spite of Butler's residence near Bedford, there is no proof of any connexion between the poets but this coincidence. But far more interesting parallels to the passage may be found in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*,[1] of whose shepherds he can write:

> For faithful heart, clean hands, and mouth as true,
> With his sweet skill my skilless youth he drew
> To have a feeling taste of Him that sits
> Beyond the heaven—far more beyond our wits.

A still more striking parallel occurs in Pepys' *Diary*, July 14th, 1667. 'Walked upon the [Epsom] Downes, where a flock of sheep was; and the most pleasant and innocent sight that ever I saw in my life. We found a shepherd and his little boy reading, far from any houses or sight of people, the Bible to him; so I made the boy read to me, which he did; with the forced tone that children do usually read, that was mighty pretty, and then I did give him something, and went to the father, and talked with him. . . . He did content himself mightily in my liking his boy's reading, and did bless God for him, the most like one of the old patriarchs that ever I saw in my life, and it brought those thoughts of the old age of the world in my mind for two or three days after.'

The Valley of the Shadow of Death, which in a few swift paragraphs gives the ghastly and spectral counterpart to the exquisite pastoral we have just left, shows Bunyan's mastery of the art of terror to be quite equal to his idyllic power. Nothing could surpass the unconscious art of this passage. The secret of effective handling of the ghastly is always reticence and suggestion. Milton's devil, with all his 'hellish tumult,' never really affrights us. He is at best but a combination of stage monster and Titanic genius. But here all is different. Professor James has pointed out that sound is the most potent of all the agencies for producing terror,[2] and that fact is utilized to the full here. They hear a 'very great groaning as of dead men,' 'words of lamentation spoken as of some in extreme torment,' and 'also a kind of hissing, as of serpents.' The fiend comes upon them, but not as he came to Christian. He is 'something yonder upon the road. . . . An ugly thing, child, an ugly thing.' 'It's like I cannot tell what.' Similarly 'something' comes behind them, a 'great padding pace.' Finally, a pit gapes across the path, enswathed in a great mist of darkness.

From the point of view of literary effectiveness, this is well-nigh perfect. As to its meaning, that is evidently the morbid condition of the soul which humiliation is apt to produce. Christiana 'never was here before,' nor can any tell what it means until they come into it themselves. Also, it is followed by 'stinks and loathsome smells'—the utter disgust which is the lasting impression of such moods. There are parts of this description which remind us of the trolls of Ibsen's *Peer Gynt*, both for realistic horror and spiritual meaning.

There follows a battle with Giant Maul—a very brisk piece of writing. Who is this new giant—plausible sophist to young pilgrims, but would-be bully to Great-heart? Bunyan is wonderfully free from bitterness about his persecution, but there can be little doubt as to his meaning here. This Giant comes out of the same cave as Pope and Pagan; and while the club is, of course, conventional as the weapon of giants, yet it may here represent the mace of authority, for there is a certain formal and legal fashion in his words. He is surely the Civil Courts of Charles II. The champions fight, and Great-heart falls on his knee for a moment. Then he recovers, and after a short prayer, conquers and slays the giant.

There follows a moment of rest and relief and merry-making. Then they come to Mr. Honest, whose conversation occupies the remaining part of the section. It is very much in the style of the former part, and reminds us of Christian's talk about Little-faith, except for the exceedingly curious note of explanation which Bunyan inserts after the paragraph about Mr. Fearing and his playing on the bass. 'I make bold to talk thus metaphorically,' is a note which would have been quite impossible in Part I. It shows the author more conscious in his art, and so further off from his story.

[1] It will be remembered that the original of the House Beautiful was built by Sir Philip Sidney's sister; cf. *The Road*, vol. i. p. 93.

[2] *Psychology*, p. 408.

Contributions and Comments.

The Children's Bread and the Dogs (Mt. xv. 21–28; Mk. vii. 24–30).

Sir John Hawkins, in his contribution to *The Synoptic Problem*, has sought to account for St. Luke's omission of any reference to this incident by suggesting that the story would naturally be distasteful to that Evangelist's Gentile readers. 'The mother's petition,' he says, 'is at first refused in terms of which we can only realize the discouragement when we call to mind the ancient and Oriental connotation—so different from our own in England now—of the name "dog"; and, to use Dr. Hort's words, when at length the boon is "granted her, nothing is said to take away from its exceptional and, as it were, extraneous character; it remains a crumb from the children's table."'[1]

This interpretation of our Lord's attitude and conduct presents considerable difficulty, and it is by no means clear that it is the right interpretation. The difficulties arising out of it are the following:—

(*a*) It represents our Lord as sharing and as expressing in what, under the circumstances, can only be described as heartless terms—the contempt which Jews felt for Gentiles; so that the Christian doctrine of the comprehensiveness of the love of God, which is the greatest glory of Christianity, would thus appear to have been foreign to the mind and teaching of Christ Himself.

(*b*) It makes our Lord condemn Himself in the fact of His doing the very thing which He Himself, at the moment of doing it, declared to be improper.[2]

It is possible, therefore, that Sir John Hawkins and the writers whom he quotes have missed the whole point of this remarkable incident, and that its real significance is quite other than they have supposed.

The Lord Jesus had passed over into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, apparently for the purpose of retirement and rest; but even there He could not be hid. A Syrophœnician woman came to Him, praying Him to have pity upon her, and to deliver her daughter from the demon with which she was possessed. For the moment Jesus gave no answer; and, as she kept following and entreating, the disciples besought Him to send her away. It was this request of theirs which drew from Him His first utterance; and what He said was addressed *to them*: 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' Thus He begins to set before their mind a problem consisting of His words and His work, the solution of which in due course by them would open up to their understanding the all-embracing scope of the goodness of God. Having been sent by the Father to the lost sheep of the house of Israel exclusively, He could not, unless by an act of wilful disobedience, exercise His superhuman power on behalf of one who was not of the house of Israel. And yet, after having expressly directed the attention of the disciples to the limitation which the Father had imposed upon His ministry, He proceeded to perform a miraculous work of healing on behalf of the Syrophœnician. What could this mean? Either that He who had ever taught the disciples that they must, above all things, seek to do the Father's will, was now Himself deliberately transgressing that will, and pointedly directing their attention to the fact of His transgression—a thing unthinkable,—or else that, in a very real and true sense, this Canaanitish woman, too, was one of the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But in what sense? The Lord Himself supplies the answer in the word that accompanies His miraculous work: 'O woman, great is thy faith.' Surely the true solution of this problem of Christ's word and work is that expressed in the words of St. Paul: 'Know therefore that they which be of faith, the same are children of Abraham.'[3] This doctrine, so intimately associated with the name of St. Paul, is, nevertheless, not St. Paul's doctrine. It is the teaching of Jesus; and the clear apprehension of it by St. Paul was for that great Apostle the inspiration of his mission to the Gentiles.

But for the woman also, and for all to whom she should tell the tale, it was necessary that the same truth should be indicated. She came and worshipped Jesus, saying, Lord, help me. He answered, It is impossible for me to take the

[1] *Synoptic Problem*, p. 73.

[2] The more probable reading in Mt 15^{26}, viz. ἔξεστι instead of ἔστι καλόν, represents the action as not a mere impropriety, but rather as a moral impossibility.

[3] Gal 3^{7}.

children's loaf and cast it to dogs! In the boldness of faith she replied, Nay, Lord, for even the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table.

The mingled wit and pathos of her answer have diverted attention from the words of Jesus; and His subsequent conduct has been interpreted in the light of what *she* said rather than in the light of His own pronouncement. He had declared that it was not fitting that what the Father had provided for the children should be wasted upon dogs. Now, this heathen woman, who was asking so much of Jesus Christ, was but a dog in the sight of Israelites; and she knew it. If in the sight of Jesus also she was only a dog, she could not, after such words as these, expect from Him, nor could He possibly bestow, the signal manifestation of the grace of God which she besought. But, moved by devoted love for her suffering child, and with sublime faith that unconsciously interpreted for her heart the love that lay concealed beneath the outward harshness of the Saviour's words, she humbled herself to accept the place of the dogs, if only she might share the crumbs. And in an instant Christ exalts her to the children's seat at the Heavenly Father's table. In His estimation, she is no dog. No chance crumbs that fall from the table are to be her portion, but rather all that her heart can desire of the Father's limitless bounty: 'O woman, great is thy faith. Let it be done unto thee even as thou wilt.' And the work accompanied the word: her daughter was healed from that very hour.

Once more, if the solution of the problem is not already plain, we may find it in the words of St. Paul: 'So then, they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham'; and again, 'For ye are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus.'

It may well be that the disciples did not then fully grasp the significance of what they saw and heard, any more than they realized the full meaning of that other memorable incident at the well of Sychar. But afterwards, when the Risen Saviour sent them forth into all the world to preach the gospel to every creature, or when St. Peter recounted to them his vision on the housetop, and the words 'What God hath made clean,' they would perhaps remember the things that Jesus had spoken. May we not find, indeed, an echo of the Saviour's words in the language of St. Peter at the Council of Jerusalem: 'And He made no distinction between us and them, *cleansing their hearts by faith*'?

G. E. Ford.

Bilston.

Galatians iv. 31–v. 1.

Is it not possible that the original reading of this passage was as follows?

ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐλευθέρας τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν. ἐν τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ οὖν ᾗ ἡμας Χριστὸς ἐλευθέρωσεν στήκετε, κ.τ.λ.

From the above reading it seems possible to explain the various readings in the MSS. The early omission of ἐν before the second clause, which could easily happen, would give rise to supposed corrections of the text.

W. R. W. Gardner.

Zeitoun, Egypt.

Our Mother the Worm.

In Mr. Thomson's sermon in The Expository Times for February, certain statements of Darwin about the work and value of the earthworm are repeated in an unqualified and indefensible form. Vastly useful as the earthworm is, it is by no means indispensable to the life of vegetation.

In the boundless north-west of Canada, where the finest wheat in the world is grown, and where the prairie grass springs from the virgin soil to the height of three to six feet, there is not a single earthworm. This interesting fact, which I was able to verify by personal observation during a year of residence on the prairie, was first brought to my notice, the day I landed in Canada, by a Doctor of Divinity, who added the remark, 'That touches Darwin's theory about God's little plough.'

To say, therefore, that without the worm 'the earth would be like a piece of iron; so hard that no rain could ever penetrate it, so closely packed that no roots could go down into it; and, even if they could, so dry and dead that no living thing could draw one grain of food from its stony heart,' is simply a riot of fancy. It illustrates the danger of that childlike faith, so characteristic of our time, which accepts as infallible every statement uttered in the name of science.

J. H. Morrison.

Falkland.

'Wateredst it with thy Foot' (Deut. xi. 10).

In the rice-growing districts of China, where water is so necessary, and yet the farmers, as a general rule, work on the principle of 'never doing to-day what can be put off until to-morrow,' we constantly see the text literally fulfilled.

These pumping machines are of a trough-like construction, of various lengths and dimensions up to about 20 feet long—hard wood boards from $7'' \times 4''$ to $14'' \times 7'' \times \frac{3}{8}''$ thick, with short pieces of wood wedged in the centre and the ends so arranged as to couple easily to its fellow, thus making an endless chain, which revolves round the cogged wheels at each end of the trough.

The upper end is fixed to an 'axle' of varying lengths. In this axle spokes are inserted as in the hub of a cart-wheel, the outer ends of which are rounded. This is placed in a framework with upright posts and a crossbar connecting them at the top, about four feet above the axle. When put together two to eight men (or women) mount on the spokes, and, with arms thrown over the cross bar at the top, press down their feet, and the water is lifted. Sometimes two or three machines are necessary to lift the water from terrace to terrace.

This is always regarded as 'hard labour,' and many are the murmurs at the inconsiderateness of 'Heaven' or 'The Ruler of Heaven' for not sending the rain just when and how they wish. On the other hand, opening the embankments to let the water flow to the lower terraces, whether with spade or feet, is never regarded as labour.

After twenty-one years' experience in districts where all burdens are carried on poles over men's shoulders, I can safely say that at least 99 per cent. find the *shoulders* give out and not the feet.

W. E. Entwistle.

China Inland Mission,
Liuanchow, Viu Wuhu, China.

Ephesians i. 6.

In the December number Mr. James Matthew suggests, as a rendering of Eph 1[6], 'To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he graced us in the Beloved.' But is the English language tolerant of such a use of 'grace' as a verb? How would this rendering do, 'To the praise of the glory of his grace,' or, 'To the praise of his glorious grace' (which is probably just about what the writer meant), '*of which he graciously made us partakers in the Beloved*'? Thus we retain the rather awkward genitive of the original and bring out the idea of Grace.

F. V. Pratt.

Congregational College, Victoria, Australia.

The Earliest Quotation of John vii. 38, 39.

In connexion with the correspondence on the meaning of Jn 7[38. 39] (The Expository Times, xxiii. 180, 235 ff.), attention may be called to a place which seems to contain the earliest quotation from or, at least, an allusion to this passage.

In the well-known letter of the Christians in Gaul about the persecution at Lyons (175 A.D., preserved by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. i), they say about the martyr Sanctus, that he remained steadfast under all tortures:

> ὑπὸ τῆς οὐρανίου πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἐξιόντος ἐκ τῆς νηδύος τοῦ Χριστοῦ δροσιζόμενος καὶ ἐνδυναμούμενος,

'being refreshed (as with dew) and strengthened by the heavenly spring of the living water *which goes out from the belly of the Christ.*' That there is an allusion to Jn 7[38] can scarcely be doubted; Ed. Schwartz quotes the passage on the margin of the new (Berlin) edition of Eusebius (vol. i. p. 410); but it is difficult to say how to combine it with our present text. Did these Christians construe?

> ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με
> καὶ πινέτω ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ·
> καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή
> Ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας Αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν.

Under αὐτοῦ they must have understood Him, the Christ, not the Christian. For brevity I may refer to a short paper on the passage in *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1909), 323, where Jn 19[34] is mentioned as the second passage which might be alluded to.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

The Fate of the Traitor.

Where we read, in Ac 1[18], that Judas *falling headlong* (πρηνὴς γενόμενος) burst asunder in the midst

and all his bowels gushed out, Papias seems to have read πρησθεὶς or πεπρησμένος. Also in the *Acta Pilati* B1 (ed. Tischendorf, 290) we have ἐλάκισεν ἐπρίσθη, which is = ἐπρήσθη. It does not seem to be recognized that this agrees with the law on the faithless woman, whose 'belly shall swell,' Nu $5^{21.22.27}$, LXX πρησθήσεται τὴν κοιλίαν. Nu 5^{21-27} ought to be put as reference on the margin of Ac 1^{18}. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

P.S.—A strange coincidence! These lines were written on the night of 31st January, when, preparing for a lesson on the O.T., I read Josephus, *Ant.* III. xi. 6: τὴν γαστέρα πρησθεῖσαν οὕτως ἀποθανεῖν. Next morning I received *The Journal of Theological Studies* for January, with the elaborate article of the Bishop of Ely (F. H. Chase), 'On πρηνὴς γενόμενος in Ac 1^{18}' (pp. 278–285). He quotes Nu 5^{21-27}, but does not point out the internal relation between the two passages. The testimony from the *Acta Pilati* is not mentioned by the bishop.

Psalm xxxi. 20.

IN a recent number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. xxiii. p. 184), Dr. Nestle, in agreement with Dr. Cheyne and others, proposes an emendation of the text in order to substitute 'the covert of thy *wings*' for 'the covert of thy *presence*' (R.V.), which latter rendering he considers 'a strange expression.' I gather that the only ground for the proposal is Dr. Nestle's difficulty in the interpretation of the present rendering. I venture to submit that when the passage is studied as poetry the difficulty disappears. The thought of the Psalmist has a parallel in a modern poem. Wordsworth has two poems on the skylark. In the shorter of the two he pictures the bird as a 'type of the wise,' and, following its flight skywards, writes:

> Leave to the nightingale her shady wood;
> A *privacy* of glorious *light* is thine.

The very glory of the sunshine protects the bird from the eye of man. Is not this also the Hebrew poet's thought of the persecuted soul that draws near to God? In the light of His countenance it is hidden from hostile eyes. Ac 22^{11}, 'And when I could not see for the glory of that light'—supports this view. A. D. MARTIN.

Buxton.

The First Recorded Prayer in the Bible.

IN *The Book of Bible Prayers*, published by Mr. J. B. Marsh of Manchester, dated, I suppose, in the sixties of last century and dedicated to his pastor, the Rev. G. B. Bubier of Salford, the first place is given to the prayer of Melchizedek for Abram: 'Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God who hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand.' Unselfish intercession is thus the beginning of all the prayers of the Bible, and is heard sounding through all its pages, the grand diapason of all its music.

W. HOPE DAVISON.

Bolton, Lancs.

The Orante.

DR. D. PLOOIJ, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxiii. 268, writes: 'The peculiar meaning of the "orante" is the cross and the baptismal confession of Christ.' Should not Ac 9^{11} be quoted in connexion with this: Ecce enim orat. ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσεύχεται? And the martyrologies give many instances of the final 'good confession,' before the fire, the wild beasts, or the axe, being with prayer.

GEORGE FARMER.

Walmer.

A New Word for the Greek Testament.

IN Mk 14^{7} all editions print εὖ ποιῆσαι as two words; but the noun εὐποιία (He 13^{16}) proves that there must have been a verb εὐποιεῖν (as one word); and, in fact, the Codex Vaticanus accentuates εὐποιῆσαι not only in Mk., but also, for instance, in Is 41^{23}, εὐποιήσατε καὶ κακώσατε. The same MS. writes regularly διατοῦτο instead of διὰ τοῦτο; and I do not see why we should not follow this practice. EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

Recent Biography.

James Hutchison Stirling.

With commendable piety and with consummate ability Miss Amelia Hutchison Stirling has written the biography of her father—*James Hutchison Stirling* (Fisher Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). It is a current impression that Dr. Hutchison Stirling's talents never found opportunity for their exercise. That impression is not removed by the biography. But it is made very clear that only in the matter of public office was the opportunity denied him. And what he lost in that way was made up, and more than made up, by the recognition of his friends and home. To have gained and held the adoration of a daughter, herself so able and energetic, is recognition which many a man would esteem above all office or emolument.

The child was father of the man. 'A little anecdote which he was often heard to relate would seem to show that, even at nine or ten, the future philosopher had within him that spirit of faith, which, later, he regarded as part of his mission to endeavour to reawaken in the minds of thinkers who were still under the influence of the eighteenth-century sceptical enlightenment. It happened, one evening, that he was very anxious to accompany his brother David, who was some ten years older than himself, to some place of entertainment, and being refused permission, he determined to go without it. So when his brother set out from the house, James slipped out after him, shut the door, took the key with him, and eagerly followed. It was a dark evening, and the boy found it by no means easy to keep in sight the figure of his brother, whose longer strides bore him rapidly through the streets, which were no doubt but dimly lighted in those days of the infancy of gas-illumination. Absorbed in his one object, he forgot everything else, till, suddenly—he knew not how or why—the thought of the house-key flashed into his brain, and he found it was gone! The shock of this alarming discovery brought his steps, and even his heart, as it seemed, to a sudden stop. For a moment or two he stood paralyzed; then, with the spontaneity of instinct, he turned to the only power that could help—in the agony of his mind, he prayed to God to help him to find the key. Retracing his steps for a few yards, he stopped, and his fingers, groping over the pavement in the dark, closed on something hard and cold. It was the lost key!

'How profound was the impression left on the mind of the philosopher by this incident is proved by the fact that he alludes to it in a letter written in 1904—seventy-four years after it took place!—remarking that the experience "acted as focus to what I say of prayer in the *Secret of Hegel*—Prayer must be believed, as it were, to stay the arm that sways the universe." It was no doubt present to him, too, when, in 1877, he concluded that strange poem which contains the summary of his philosophy (*I am that I am*) with these lines:—

Brute is the world in externality,
And blind, still stumbling in contingency;
But I, even I, am Lord: I will control
The monstrous masses, as they wheel, and check
Them there, and smooth the pillow for thy head—
Make thou thyself but mine—but me—in Prayer.'

That is a long quotation. It will make many more words superfluous. Let it be understood simply that while the life itself is recorded with generous fulness and with frank loyalty, the biographer has done us the further service of showing what were the grounds upon which so high an estimate was formed of Dr. Stirling's work, and especially of his great book *The Secret of Hegel*. The biography is never used for the discussion of philosophy. The chapter on *The Secret of Hegel* offers even to the uninitiated an entrance into the 'Secret,' but it does this while fulfilling part of the purpose of the biography.

Bishop Ernest Wilberforce.

The Life of the Right Rev. Ernest Roland Wilberforce, First Bishop of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and afterward Bishop of Chichester—such is the full title which Mr. J. B. Atlay has given to his life of Bishop Ernest Wilberforce (Smith, Elder, & Co.; 10s. 6d. net). Mr. Atlay is the author of a Memoir of Sir Henry Acland and other biographical books, so that he knows how to write biography, and he

has written this biography well. He maintains a steady level of excellence throughout. If he never rises to the very highest height of passionate devotion, he certainly never descends to any depth of bathos or bad taste. And his accomplishment is the more meritorious that it is manifest he had extremely little material to work upon. Bishop Ernest Wilberforce kept no diary; he was in far too great a hurry all his life to be a letter writer; and with the single exception of temperance there was no great public cause with which he was prominently identified. Nevertheless, the biography was worth writing, and it has been, as we said, thoroughly well written.

If Bishop Ernest Wilberforce had not the intellectual range of his father, Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, he had something of more consequence than that—concentration of will and transparency of motive. It was sometimes said that he lived to show that a Wilberforce could have another aim in life than to be 'all things to all men,' and that consequently he was not so careful to avoid the 'entrance into a quarrel' as he might have been. But if he had his enemies, and more of them than he need have had, he had friends not a few who 'grappled him to their soul with hooks of steel.'

The home life of such a man is sure to be a beautiful one, and there is nothing finer in the book, or indeed in anything that we have seen in recent biography, than this letter which was written by one of his boys while at school in Winchester:

'My Darling Father,—Thank you very much for your letter . . . I wish you hadn't been so terribly busy last holidays, for I don't seem to have seen anything of you all the time, but next holidays we will make up for it; and in the meanwhile I want *you* to take a little holiday. I couldn't help noticing when I was at home, that you didn't seem at all well and that you hadn't got properly strong again from that horrid influenza; and I am sure that the only way to get properly well is to go away for a bit on a sea voyage or some other little trip. I know how every one is bothering you to do so, and how unpleasant the idea of it is to you, who don't like giving in to anything, least of all, to doctors and suchlike. . . . I know what a strong will and what indomitable pluck you have, and how you love to stand up against anything, however strong it is, and that in the end you generally overcome all difficulties; but influenza is no common kind of illness; it affects the strongest men most and leaves them weaker than those who are naturally weak.

'Do forgive me writing in this fatherly way to you—but I do it out of my own love to you, my darling Father, and out of love for Mother, for I don't think you can tell how sad she is at your being so unwell. I know this is all stale advice that I have written, for so many men, and all of them knowing so much more than I do, have told you just the same thing, but, as they have so far failed, I thought that I would try and persuade you, and I hope and pray I may not have written in vain. Don't be angry with me for writing this letter, but do think it over seriously, and I pray God that you may think it right to take a good rest. And now good-bye, darling Father, with very much love.—Ever your devoted son, Roland.

'*P.S.*—I put "private" at the beginning as I thought you would like to read it through by yourself first.'

John Wesley's Journal.

The third volume of the standard edition of *The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.* (Kelly), is not behind the previous two in human interest. And, again, not a little of the interest is found in the footnotes. There we read the story of Grace Murray, the impulsive interference of his brother Charles, who protested, 'All our preachers would leave us, all our societies disperse,' if John married 'so mean a woman'; her marriage to Bennet; John Wesley's distress when the news was brought to him, 'but I could not shed a tear'; and then the reconciliation with Charles. 'Too late,' says the footnote, 'Charles Wesley discovered that he had persuaded John Bennet to marry his brother's betrothed fiancée and had led Grace to believe that "the important person" who had steadfastly loved her for ten years had actually expressed the wish that, for the sake of the work of God, she would marry another. It was indeed,' continues the editor, 'not a "Comedy," but a "Tragedy of Errors." The marriage of Grace Murray, either with Bennet or Wesley, was, *per se*, a matter of small moment compared with a breach between John and Charles Wesley, which must, at that critical period have either rent the Methodist Society in twain, or, more probably, scattered it to the winds. The disaster was averted by the

tact and tenderness of George Whitefield and John Nelson, and by John Wesley's extraordinary self-control and charity.'

The volume covers the period of activity from 1742 to 1751.

George Fox's Journal.

From the Cambridge Press has been issued a new edition of *The Journal of George Fox* (2 vols., 21s. net). It is a handsome book; a book which, outwardly at any rate, neither the University of Cambridge nor the Society of Friends need be ashamed of. But more than that, it is at last an edition of the Journal which has been called for by the modern demand for unprejudiced accuracy and which is worthy to be placed beside the great standard edition of Wesley's Journal. It is a satisfaction to know that editions of both these great works have been produced (or are being produced, for Wesley's Journal is not complete yet) in our day with the sole object of reaching the truth and setting down everything as it is known, without favour and without fear.

The editor of the Journal is Mr. Norman Penny, F.S.A., who is editor of the Journal of the Friends' Historical Society, and librarian of the Friends' Reference Library, Devonshire House. His position gives him quite unique opportunities for discovering the best text of the Journal and for writing the most useful notes on it, and he has used his opportunities with judgment and discrimination. Nor has he been reluctant to call to his assistance other historians of Quakerism, such as Mr. W. C. Braithwaite of Banbury. This edition of the Journal is accepted by the Society of Friends as the standard edition to which all writing on Quakerism must henceforth refer.

Booker T. Washington.

If ever a man had a mission Mr. Booker T. Washington has it, and if ever a man deserved to succeed in his mission it is the same man. His new book is a sort of biography; its title is *My Larger Education* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). But like all the rest of his books it has been written for the purpose of healing the breach between Black and White, and it is written in so conciliatory and yet so manly a spirit that it surely cannot fail to make some impression in that direction. Mr. Washington is as earnest as the Apostle Paul, and just because of his earnestness he is as ready to become all things to all men. He has a chapter entitled 'My Experience with Reporters and Newspapers,' in which, an enemy might say, he pats the reporter on the back for his own purposes. But the saying would be untrue. Every word in it is straightforward, truthful, and in good taste.

Hudson Taylor.

We have no right to say of any man that it would have been better if he had never been born. Only One had that right. But of many a man's biography we could say it would have been better if it had not been written. Shall we say this of the biography of Hudson Taylor? The man was so supremely great that only the greatest kind of biography could be satisfactory. And his greatness was of goodness, the highest and the most difficult to describe.

But Hudson Taylor left a son, able and willing. That son married a wife able and willing as himself. And the biography we have of Hudson Taylor, written by Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor, is one of the most lifelike and therefore greatest biographies that have been published for many a year. The whole life's history is not in it. Its title is *Hudson Taylor in Early Years* (Morgan & Scott; 7s. 6d.). The rest will follow. It was a good plan to give the biography in parts. Two or three great volumes coming out at once would have frightened half the readers who will read this book and wait anxiously for its successor.

We are receiving from the Bollandists every now and then a new volume of the 'Acta Sanctorum.' There is a larger Acts of the Saints being acted and described, and this is a volume of it. We sometimes wonder if Christ could countenance the deeds that are attributed to some 'saints'; this saint seems to our modern apprehension to be wholly after the mind of Christ. Even in his early years, do we not see that Christ was formed in him his hope of glory?

G. W. E. Russell.

The Right Hon. George W. E. Russell has been for some time—not in his dotage, no by no means, but in his anecdotage. His latest book he calls *Afterthoughts* (Grant Richards; 7s. 6d. net). It is a book to pick up as you might pick up some frivolous volume of fiction when the day's work is over. It is the easiest of easy reading—remini-

scences that are restful, that require no effort to understand, and that furnish no untimely excitement. There is one rousing chapter, and fortunately it is found near the beginning. It is the chapter on Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe. At every stage of her struggle against the greatest of human abominations, says Mr. Russell, Mrs. Stowe was nobly backed by her brother, Henry Ward Beecher. In 1856 the great preacher gave in his church at Plymouth an object-lesson in Slavery, not soon forgotten by those who witnessed it.

'The solemn, impressive silence of that vast congregation was absolutely painful when a young woman slowly ascended the stairs leading to the pulpit. Instantly assuming the look and manner of a slave-auctioneer, the minister called for bids. "Look," he exclaimed, "at this marketable commodity—human flesh and blood like yourselves. You see the white blood of her father in her regular features and high, thoughtful brow. Who bids? Look at her trim figure and her wavy hair—how much do you bid for them? She is sound in wind and limb. I'll warrant her. Who bids? Her feet and hands are small and finely formed. What do you bid for her? She is a Christian woman—I mean 'a praying nigger'—and that makes her more valuable, because it ensures her docility and obedience to your wishes. 'Servants, obey your masters,' you know. Well, she believes in that doctrine. How much for her? Will you allow this praying woman to be sent back to Richmond to meet the fate for which her father sold her? If not, who bids? Who bids?"

'The congregation was wrought to the highest pitch of excitement. Some one laid a bank-note at the preacher's feet. Then the collecting plates were passed round, and money and jewellery poured into them. Women took off their bracelets and rings, and men unfastened their watches. From time to time Beecher's voice rang out, "In the name of Christ, Christian men and women, how much do you bid?"

'The congregation was stirred beyond description, and a well-known merchant rose in his place and said that, whatever deficiency in the price demanded remained when the collection was counted up, it would be made good by himself and his friends. "Then you are free," said Beecher, turning to the girl beside him, and the pent-up emotion of the audience found vent in sobs.'

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. H. D. Waller, Flushing, N.Y., and the Rev. W. B. Hoult, M.A., B.D., Rawtenstall, Manchester.

Illustrations for the Great Text for May must be received by the 1st of April. The text is Is 40^{6-8}.

The Great Text for June is Is $53^{1.\ 2}$—'Who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.' A copy of Agnew's *Life's Christ Places*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or of the 'Great Texts of the Bible,' will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for July is Ro $1^{3.\ 4}$—'Concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of MacCulloch's *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, or of Curtis's *A History of Creeds and Confessions*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for August is 2 Ch 25^{2}—'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart'; along with 2 Ch 31^{21}—'He did it with all his heart, and prospered.' A copy of Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for September is 1 Co 4^{5}—'Wherefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God.' A copy of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE leading article in the second number of *The International Review of Missions* has been written by Professor David S. CAIRNS, D.D. Its subject is stated, very harmlessly, as 'Christian Missions and International Peace.' In reality it is a direct discussion of a single issue—What would be the effect on missionary enterprise if Britain and Germany were to go to war?

Why does Professor CAIRNS discuss such an issue? Evidently because, just before writing, he was staggered, as we were all staggered, by the appalling news that 'through the pleasant summer days of 1911,' these two European nations 'had been walking through the valley of the shadow of death.' He is not a breeder of alarms. 'The tales of deliberate aggression on either side may be dismissed as mischievous fables.' But he sees clearly that these two nations were very nearly approaching a situation which, without their consent or knowledge, would have made war inevitable.

And if Britain and Germany had gone to war? It is hardly conceivable that the war would have been confined to Britain and Germany. 'The whole history of the last fifty years and the unstable equilibrium of Europe to-day make such limitation practically inconceivable. The greater and the lesser powers of the larger part of Europe would have been grouped together in two mighty alliances, each bent on crippling and even destroying the other.

Now Dr. CAIRNS is not writing to show what would be the national results of such a war. 'Happily,' he says, 'there are many who are engaged on this task. The real brain and heart of Germany and Britain are not with the Chauvinist press, but with those who are demonstrating the madness and sin of war, who are showing the financial ruin which it would entail on the victors as well as the vanquished, the political and social retrogression, the unthinkable measure of human anguish, the brutalization of character which would follow. There is no need here to add to what is being so well said by the graver and deeper minds among our statesmen and public teachers, as to how a European war would affect our civilization.'

What he recognizes, and would have us all recognize, is the effect which such a war would have on the progress of the Kingdom of God. At the Edinburgh Conference in 1910 it was borne home to him that the Kingdom of God is an ideal that can be realized. He could have seen that, no doubt, without a Conference. For the practicability of the Kingdom is involved in the fact that God has been revealed as the Almighty Father, that Christianity is the final and uni-

versal religion, and that to faith all things are possible.

The impression made upon him by the Edinburgh Conference was that the Kingdom of God may be made actual *now*. He does not deny the possibility of an over-emphasis being put on the limit of opportunity. But he saw that the opportunity was really offered. It was offered by the spirit of unity which ran through the Conference. Heart to heart, hand in hand, men and women were ready to go forward in every part of the earth and by means of every diversity of operation. The hour had come for an advance in force, and let God do the rest.

But now, 'right into this nascent world of aspiration and effort and prayer there has come the danger of a deeper national cleavage than modern history has known for nearly a hundred years. We cannot but ask what bearing such an event would have upon these ideals. While others are asking what such an event would mean for civilization and for the happiness and political progress of the European nations, we must take a wider view, which includes but transcends these, and ask what a European war would mean for the Kingdom of God.'

It would mean, first of all, that an enormous financial strain would be thrown upon the countries involved. The necessary resources would be withdrawn from the world mission at the very moment when great expansion is required. There is no aggressive project, says Professor CAIRNS, that would not at once feel the effect. Plans for increasing the evangelizing forces in the field, for building and equipping Christian schools and universities, for developing industrial schemes and technical training institutes, would all be arrested. Everywhere throughout Asia and Africa men would be compelled to wait idly and see the great flood tide that might have carried them into harbour sweep past them and turn again to the fatal ebb.

But that is only to touch the circumference. Far more disastrous would be the moral and spiritual effect upon the Church if the great powers of Europe were to turn their mighty energies on the maiming and destruction of one another. Neither Britain nor Germany could emerge from that struggle, whether victor or vanquished, without enormous losses. Can the cause of human progress, can the Kingdom of God go forward without both of them? With all their weaknesses and sins these two nations stand for progress and liberty as well as order, and their latent capacity for the service of the Kingdom is past measuring. Why should their noble energies of heart and brain, that might be turned to such splendid profit in the constructive labour of the Kingdom of God, be squandered in sanguinary struggle for predominance? There cannot be such a misuse of noble gifts without disaster to the higher life of both lands.

'Here,' he believes, 'we touch the heart of the whole matter. The real springs of life are in God, and they break forth in great rivers of power and blessing whenever He finds those through whom He can work His will. But such men, when all is said, arise out of the common life of the Church and the nation in which they are born and which mould or mar them in their early and plastic years. Hence the problem of the winning of the world for the Kingdom is a problem in large measure of the corporate life. When that is depressed or brutalized, the Spirit of God is withheld. When it rises and becomes more spiritual, the channels between Eternity and Time are opened, and prayer wins a new power and freedom. All men who have given serious thought to the problem realize that the Kingdom of God in our day can only draw nearer if the Church as a whole becomes more imbued with faith in God and love to man and hope for the future, that here lie the very springs of all else. Fundamentally the whole problem is one of depth and quality of life. Now can any one suppose that the concentration of the energies of Europe on warfare

can have anything but a disastrous effect on the life of society and the Church? In such a medium who can doubt that it will be harder to pray, harder to believe in God and man, harder to live for humanity? The veil which to some to-day seems growing thinner and more transparent will fall heavy and black between man and God.'

Professor CAIRNS does not deny the element of nobility that emerges in a great war. To speak of war as 'organized murder' he calls unjust and untrue. But this is a by-product of war, and he counts it absurd to treat it as anything else. The tribal feuds of savage races have their deeds of heroism and even their habits of endurance; and yet, he says, no one thinks of the general condition of civilization which produced them as anything but barbarous. And then he gives an example.

'If war had broken out last summer between Britain and Germany, there would in all probability have been a sea fight on the waters of Lake Nyasa in full view of the wild tribes who have just been redeemed from a condition of incessant warfare. No man has ever suggested a doubt that the turning of the energies of the Angoni into the manifold peaceful industries and arts taught at Livingstonia, the Iona of tropical Africa, marks a great rise in civilization. What is even more to our purpose in this connexion is that to-day it is easier for an Angoni to believe in God, to pray to Him, to receive His Spirit, and to love his fellowmen than it was a few years ago. But we cannot have it both ways. If these things are true, a European war would be due to the resurgence of the savage in the civilized state, and would, broadly regarded, brutalize the whole life of Christendom just as the Thirty Years' War did in its day.'

What is Wrong with the Churches? This is the popular title of a book, popular also in size and price, which has been written by the Rev. David BARRAN (James Clarke & Co.; 6d. net). Mr. BARRAN finds the churches more empty than they ought to be. When a census is taken, not more than ten or fifteen per cent. of the population are present. And he sets himself seriously to discover the cause.

He discovers the cause after a very few paragraphs. It is 'the want of a definite message.' He believes that if you enter a church and listen to the sermon, you will quite likely depart without any distinct impression, emotional or intellectual. Preachers do not seem to know what the Christian religion is, or, if they know it themselves, they cannot make it known to the average hearer. If one preacher is intelligible, he is contradicted by the next intelligible preacher. It is a house divided against itself, how then can it stand?

This may be true although it is not new. But Mr. BARRAN will not admit that it is not new. Attacks have been made on Christianity and the Christian Churches from the very beginning. Mr. BARRAN finds traces of them in the New Testament itself. But the attacks were from without. Never before did the Church set herself to show how unstable were her own foundations and how near she was to utter and irretrievable ruin. The novelty of Mr. BARRAN'S discovery is here. 'Some who occupy influential places in the Churches maintain that historical Christianity is being undermined, and is in imminent danger of falling to pieces. These declarations reach the ears of the man in the street, and they do not dispose him to enter the Church or to take any kind of interest in it.'

In former days, says Mr. BARRAN, every Church had its creed and every preacher had to respect it. 'The early Methodists believed in the infallibility of the Scriptures, in the ruin of man, and in a hell of physical tortures.' The Presbyterians accepted 'The Westminster Confession of Faith' as their standard of authority. Even Congregationalists, he says, were bound by their trust deeds; and these

trust deeds declared what doctrines were to be preached and upheld. He gives the following excerpt from a trust deed by way of illustration: 'That the said ground and chapel shall be held by the said Trustees . . . for such as shall in all time hereafter maintain the exclusive authority and entire sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures in all matters of belief and duty: the doctrine of salvation by free grace through faith in the obedience and atonement of Jesus Christ, God manifested in the flesh.'

These trust deeds and confessions are now ignored. They are regarded, not as supports, but as stumbling-blocks. For the time came when Scripture had to be squared with science. The 'Word' was read as it perhaps had never been read before, but it was not read for the purpose of establishing doctrine or even for the purpose of establishing itself. It was read in order that men might see whether, after all the demands of physical science had been met, there was anything left in it that could really be said to be profitable for instruction, in any department whatever of life or of doctrine. The result was that the old doctrines of Election, Atonement, Future Punishment, and the rest were declared to be obsolete and incredible; the confessions were either modified or neglected; the trust deeds were consigned to the lumber-room.

But the Church is not built on doctrines, it is built on facts. Cannot the Church remain after the doctrines have been discredited? Mr. Barran has not found it so. For no sooner were the doctrines discredited than the facts began to be assailed, and now it has come to pass that within the very walls of the Churches themselves, men are preaching the possibility that no such person as Jesus of Nazareth ever existed, and freely declaring that if He did exist, He existed only as a man among men, with a man's weaknesses and even with a man's shortcomings and sins.

What is Mr. Barran's remedy? His remedy is simply to return to Scripture and study it over again. But we must return to it with open minds. If physical science tells us that miracle is impossible, and if Scripture tells us that miracles have taken place, we must not believe physical science and disbelieve Scripture. More than that, we must know that there are more things both in heaven and in earth than physical science can ever attain to. Mr. Barran does not say we shall recover all our trust deeds and confessions. He does not say that we shall ever again hold all the doctrines of Christianity in the very form in which our fathers held them. He does say that an unprejudiced study of the Bible will authenticate it to any man's mind as true, in respect both of the facts and the doctrines of redemption. He says that it will restore to the Churches the true God and eternal life.

The time has come for an inquiry into the practical value of mysticism. For the interest in mysticism is more widespread now than ever it was before. And philosophy has at last abandoned its opposition; there is no longer anything standing in the way. Such an investigation has accordingly been made by the Rev. O. C. Quick. It has become a habit with the *Journal of Theological Studies* to publish one long article in theology, and for the rest to offer documents and discussions. This article always occupies the first place. In the number for January of this year the first place is occupied by Mr. Quick's article on 'The Value of Mysticism in Faith and Practice.'

Those who have desired to investigate the phenomena of mysticism have hitherto been met at the outset by a very serious obstacle. Mysticism claims to transcend the intellect. It does not claim to be opposed to the intellect, but to be independent of it. Now it has hitherto been held that the intellect is the only faculty by which knowledge can be obtained. So that the very possibility of mystical knowledge was excluded beforehand.

But the absolute supremacy of the intellect in all matters of knowledge has now been challenged. The pragmatist movement has drawn attention to the part played by the will and the emotions, both in the obtaining and in the testing of knowledge, and has created a widespread doubt as to the possibility of a merely intellectual criterion. And so, for the first time, religious mysticism has now an opportunity of vindicating its claim to make a real contribution to the sum of human knowledge and experience.

But, first of all, do we understand what mysticism is? Mr. QUICK apparently does not think that we do; for he begins with a definition. Giving the term its widest sense, he thinks he may safely assert that 'the claim of all mystical experience is to tell us of some wider reality beyond ourselves which is not directly apprehensible by or through the senses.' If that definition is true, it is evident enough that we did not know what mysticism is. For it has always been taken for granted that mysticism had something to do with religion. Mr. QUICK would not confine its operation to the sphere of religion. Nevertheless, he admits that this 'wider reality beyond ourselves' is usually understood to be God. Or if it is not immediately apprehended as God, it has at any rate an effect upon the mind's idea about God. He therefore concludes that after all and 'in a sense' all mysticism has a bearing upon religion; and if we were to express our investigation into the practical value of mysticism in the form of the question, 'What does it tell us of God?' we should not exclude much mysticism from our inquiry.

Now when we ask the question, What does mysticism tell us about God? we receive a bewildering variety of answers. In the first place, there are many mystics whose direct experiences of the presence of God or of Christ can easily be brought within the doctrine of the Catholic Church. They may even make us feel the beauty and truth of orthodox Christianity as we never felt it before. St. Francis of Assisi, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Catherine of Genoa, our own Juliana of Norwich, and occasionally perhaps St. John of the Cross and St. Teresa—all these and others, as long as we are under their spell, do undoubtedly seem to guarantee to our minds the Church's revelation. And even beyond those who may be called the classical school of mysticism there are spiritual lives, such as those of Bunyan, John Wesley, William Law, and a host of others in various Christian communities, whose writings have a similar effect in confirming our faith. Even the revivalistic phenomena, so entertainingly described by Professor William JAMES, in his Gifford Lectures on 'Varieties of Religious Experience,' though occasionally a little behindhand in spiritual dignity, do also, in the judgment of Mr. QUICK, remain true to broadly Christian teaching. Last of all, there are the experiences of religious individuals like Tolstoy, who belong to no Church or denomination; they also show no vital discrepancy with the central doctrines of Christianity, even where they do not yield them direct support.

But while all this is true, there is much more than this that is called mysticism. What are we to say of the vast and organized system of Eastern mysticism, which teaches the absorption of the soul in a universal, characterless, and impersonal Unity? Does not Plotinus, the father of European mysticism, occasionally use language that is very like that of the Eastern mystics? And can we not trace the course of a similar non-Christian experience and doctrine as it passes through pseudo-Dionysius into the heart of the Catholic Church, where with inconvenient persistency they leave their mark on the writings of some of her most distinguished children? Can we hope, says Mr. QUICK, to Christianize wholly the teaching of the *via negativa* even as understood by so devout a Churchman as Meister Eckhart, with its theological denial of attributes to God and its practical consequence of withdrawal from the society of men?

Even in the modern and Western world we meet with movements which seem to be mystical, but are at least unchristian if not anti-christian. Such a movement is mental healing in America, at the very centre of which there exists a strong touch of mystical experience. More than all that, there are records in our day of experiences of the Infinite which are definitely evil in character, and which leave on the mind an impression of horror such as no words can ever represent. And it is not enough to say that these experiences belong to persons of unsound mind. Lunatic asylums, says Mr. QUICK, could no doubt furnish innumerable instances of a similar nature; but they are not all found in lunatic asylums, and could not possibly be all sent there.

Now, however these experiences differ the one from the other, they are alike in this, that they claim to be objective and that they claim to be undeniable. Objectivity and certainty—these two things are claimed by mystics of every kind and of every country. And Mr. QUICK agrees with Professor William JAMES, that such mystical experiences can be used to support any kind of religious or irreligious belief whatsoever. The inference, therefore, he considers inevitable, that mystical knowledge carries with it no internal criterion of its own validity. In his own words: 'It is manifestly impossible even to draw a rigid and immediate distinction between the results of divine and valid and those of diabolic and illusory inspiration; the shades of the experiences are too varied and pass too subtly into one another.'

Has it come to this, then, that we had better sweep away the whole claim to mystical knowledge as a snare and a delusion? Mr. QUICK does not think so. The internal criterion has broken down. But that only drives us to seek some means external to the experiences themselves of discriminating between their truth and falsehood. Is there any standpoint by which they can be judged? There are three such standpoints, and they are of the more value that they can be made to apply independently.

There is first of all our Lord's great spiritual criterion, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' This standpoint of value, says Mr. QUICK, is as applicable to mystical states as it is to individual lives. It is a mere truism, but it is a truism that we must never be tired of repeating, that the oldest, surest, and most universal witness of God in the world is a good life. Not every one has mystical experiences, not every one has learning in theology, or belongs to a Church. But every one has some notion of the difference between a good and a bad life. If, therefore, a man comes forward claiming to have obtained a higher revelation than that already known to us, his claim will at once be made subject to the test whether this higher revelation gives the man himself a deeper conviction of sin and a keener desire for righteousness than he had before.

This test enables us at once to set aside some mystical experiences as morbid, harmful, or illusory. They do not tend to make life better; they do not stimulate the moral faculty or encourage any other healthy branch of human activity. They tend rather to undermine character, to weaken vitality, and to diminish the forces that are at war with evil in the world.

Of course we must be careful not to apply too narrow a test. We are to investigate the value of mysticism in faith and practice. But what do we mean by practice? Do we mean that the mystic by means of his mysticism must be able to do things he could not do before? We have no right to make that demand. The mind of the mystic may be more contemplative than active; it is enough if his mysticism enables him to *be* something more and better than he was able to be without it.

It is, however, at the same time a striking circumstance that some of the most distinguished

of the Christian mystics were as distinguished for practical energy and ability as for contemplative devotion. The instances which at once spring to the mind are those of St. Francis of Assisi and St. Catherine of Siena. The movement of reform which St. Francis instituted, even if its immediate effects were short-lived, is still felt as an inspiration to lives of self-sacrifice in the service of God and man. St. Catherine of Siena was the inspirer of the papal policy during a critical period in its history. Her judgment was no doubt sometimes warped, either by the partizanship of the doctrinaire or by the simple-mindedness of the child of light. Yet in the main her counsel was as sound and statesmanlike as it was undoubtedly the fruit of her inward communing with the Unseen.

But we must not apply the test of practice so as to exclude from the realm of true mysticism experiences against which we have nothing to say except that they are abnormal, provided they are verifiable in the world at large and stand the test of application to human life. There are, it is true, certain experiences derived from the use of drugs, and some hallucinations of the mentally unsound, which claim a complete objectivity and inspire an intense conviction. But they do not stand the test of verification or of application to life. They are therefore not only to be avoided, but to be denied the right of authority even over those to whom they come. On the other hand, there is a strong vein of mysticism in the profoundly ethical genius of Socrates, who constantly felt the guidance of his dæmon, and was apparently subject to a peculiar form of trance. It was some kind of abnormal experience that inspired the fervour of the Hebrew prophet; and Mr. Quick thinks that it is perhaps worth while to remark that Ezekiel, whose peculiar psycho-physical constitution seems to resemble most nearly that of the mystic saints, was at the same time the first Hebrew to receive and formulate the fundamental postulate of ethics, that the individual is responsible for what he himself has done.

But the test of a good life is only one of the tests which may be applied to mysticism in order to ascertain its value for faith and practice. Another is to lay its results alongside of the doctrines of theology and see how they agree together. Professor William James denies the right of theology to estimate the value of mysticism. Saints, he says, are saints whether their theology is Buddhist, Christian, or Stoic. But Mr. Quick holds that you can always distinguish a Buddhist from a Christian saint, and that the difference is due to their theology. In the Christian Church, he says, we have a magnificent succession of more or less mystical personalities, who not only instituted religious orders, but also exercised a most important influence in practical fields, such as politics, education, and the care of the sick. On the other hand, Oriental mystics, while leading pure and noble lives, tend to cut themselves off from men, and to survey the world with a superior though kindly pity, which can only withdraw itself from the evil it knows to be invincible. The difference lies really in the whole spiritual power breathing through these two types of life: the active power of the love of God on the one side, and the passive stability of union with the All on the other. In other words, the Christian mystic is inspired by a better theology than the Oriental; the Incarnation is a more fruitful principle than Pantheism.

Now, when we apply the test of theology, we not only find that in general the better theology gives the better mystic, we also find that in particular cases mysticism has failed to produce good results because of the necessity of keeping in touch with a theology that was itself impure and unprogressive. Why did Greek divination remain on the lower level of magic, and never rise, as Hebrew did, to the height of prophecy? It was because that power to whose action the wonders of divination were attributed by the Greeks was not one God, personal and holy, but a mixed crowd of gods and goddesses of all ranks, grades, and characters. The theology was debased; and it

was the debased theology that rendered the Greek religion incapable of producing from among its seers any one worthy of the title of prophet.

It may be a surprising but it is no longer an unaccountable thing, that the Church of Rome, in which the influence of orthodoxy has been strongest, has also been richest in mystics. Mystical saints often emphasize their need of external guidance. Saint John of the Cross, Saint Teresa, Saint Catherine of Siena, and Saint Catherine of Genoa, all feel intense dread of deception and delusion in raptures and visions, and look upon mysticism apart from ecclesiastical authority as dangerous in the extreme. All this tends to show that the mystic state, having no specific intellectual content of its own, needs the support of some external theological system, and recognizes the fairness of being judged by the standard of that system.

This is the defect which Mr. Quick discovers in the Modern Mind-Cure Movement. Its leaders, he says, have indeed grasped a general and permanent aspect of mystical truth, and they have applied it in a way which the Church has ignored, to her cost. But he thinks it difficult to imagine that exhortations 'to realize one's own Divinity' and 'feel oneself a conscious part of the Deity' will either meet with a wide response or inspire the noblest form of saintliness. And he asks, Might not the influence of an orthodox theology have preserved the practical efficiency of this teaching, while preventing its expression in terms which are not only intellectually absurd, in the sense that they utterly fail to support the inferences drawn from them, but also jar most harshly on the sense of reverence inseparable from the highest type of religious mind?

The third test is the test of science. It is not theology nor philosophy, it is science that has been the persistent opponent of mysticism; and yet Mr. Quick believes that it is in relation to science that mysticism possesses its special religious value at the present time.

In the first place, during recent years psychology has made a considerable advance towards furnishing an explanation of the form of mystical experience by referring it through the hypothesis of the sub-conscious self to the process known as automatism or auto-suggestion. And it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which such an explanation may have for religion. For in proportion as any experience is inexplicable, it remains, from the human point of view, not only miraculous, but fortuitous, since we can know nothing of the conditions under which it arises, or the principle on which it is bestowed. Take conversion. As long as conversion remains *merely* a miracle, we cannot help the sinner to attain it. Therefore all scientific explanation is to be welcomed.

But, after all, it is only the form, the method of transmission, or the conditions of the experience that psychology explains. One important thing in the experience, that is, its spiritual value, remains outside the province of psychology, and beyond the reach of science. The Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and science may hear the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth.

The result is that science has hitherto ignored mysticism, and mysticism, as a rule, has been ignorant of science. That attitude will no longer be maintained. Mysticism and science are found to represent two opposite sides of truth. The pronouncements of the one must not be made the test of the value of the other. But just because the one is the supplement of the other, they furnish a corrective of one another. In the words of Baron von Hügel, science supplies to the mystic 'a manly and bracing humiliation'; it softens that note of appropriation of the Almighty which seems to sound through some of the extravagances of mystical literature. It forces also upon his atten-

tion the supreme need of practical method and the reality of intellectual difficulty and doubt, aspects of life which all but the greatest mystics tend to ignore.

What, then, after all these corrections, is the value of mysticism for faith and practice? Its value is that it keeps the eternal ever before us in this our earthly and temporal life. Mr. QUICK does not claim that it has added anything to the knowledge that we have of God in the face of Jesus Christ. He claims only that it keeps God very near.

Wesley's Doctrine of Assurance.

BY THE REV. FREDERICK BALCH, MONTROSE.

THE steps of that pilgrimage which led Wesley at last into possession of the full assurance of faith were all taken Godward. Wesley's conversion has been variously placed, but, taking the word to mean a turning from evil to God, we can see that Wesley from his youth up had set his face to seek God. The final step of that search was taken on the memorable 24th of May 1738. His early training laid the foundation, says Canon Overton, 'of that simplicity, guilelessness, and unworldliness, which were his strongly marked characteristics all through his life.' His father admitted him to the Lord's table when he was only eight years of age. He was eleven when he entered the Charterhouse School. Tyerman says, 'Wesley, while at this seat of learning, lost the religion which had marked his character from the days of infancy . . . John Wesley entered the Charterhouse a saint, and left it a sinner.'[1] It was not so bad as that. 'I still read the Scriptures, and said my prayers, morning and evening. And what I now hoped to be saved by, was (1) not being so bad as other people; (2) having still a kindness for religion; and (3) reading the Bible, going to church, and saying my prayers.'[2] His life at Oxford followed the same lines. 'Being removed to the University for five years, I still said my prayers both in public and private, and read with the Scriptures several other books of religion, especially comments on the New Testament. Yet I had not all this while so much as a notion of inward holiness; nay, went on habitually, and, for the most part, very contentedly, in some or other known sin—indeed, with some intermission and short struggles, especially before and after the Holy Communion, which I was obliged to receive thrice a year. I cannot tell what I hoped to be saved by now when I was continually sinning against the little light I had; unless by those transient fits of what many divines taught me to call repentance.'[2]

We follow him to find him greatly influenced by three books, *The Imitation of Christ*, *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, and *The Serious Call*. *The Imitation*, with its keynote of devotion, flashed its search-light on one point only—that of personal communion with God. It is not concerned with the results of spiritual communion. It never sees humanity's needs. It helped to centre Wesley's thoughts on Christ, and to give a form of spiritual selfishness to the early struggle. (He went to Georgia in 1735, 'to save his soul.') Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Holy Dying* led him to make the decision. 'I resolved to dedicate all my life to God.' He got much of his High Church bent from this work. Law's *Serious Call*, with its central teaching, 'nothing godly can be alive in us, but what has all its life from the Spirit of God, living and breathing in us,' gave him a new view of spiritual life and intensified its purpose.

With opened eyes Wesley searches the Bible as the one, the only standard of truth. His quest was for 'a uniform following of Christ, an entire inward and outward conformity to our Master.'

The formation of the 'Holy Club' helped Wesley and the Oxford Methodists, by self-discipline, service, and study, to reach a fairly complete knowledge of what a Christian ought to be and do, but the way of attainment was not yet clear to him.

Wesley is now a Fellow of Lincoln College, and has taken Holy Orders. He preaches before the University on January 1, 1733, and defines 'faith' as

[1] *Life and Times of Wesley*, vol. i. pp. 21, 22.
[2] *Journals*, May 24, 1738.

'an unshaken assent to all that God hath revealed in Scripture, and in particular to those important truths—"Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners"; "He bare our sins in his own body on the tree"; "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."' Long after the Aldersgate Street experience, Wesley republished this sermon, with this remarkable addition, 'Not only an unshaken assent, but likewise the revelation of Christ in our hearts; a divine evidence or conviction of His love, His free unmerited love to me a sinner; a sure confidence in His pardoning mercy, wrought in us by the Holy Ghost, a confidence whereby every true believer is enabled to bear witness, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that Jesus Christ the Righteous is my Lord and the propitiation for my sins. I know He hath loved me; and I have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins."'[1]

Wesley's further steps in the discovery of the doctrine of assurance led him to Georgia, where Spangenberg, the Moravian, probed his heart thus: '"My brother . . . Have you the witness within yourself? Does the Spirit of God bear witness with your spirit that you are the child of God?" I was surprised and knew not what to answer. He observed it, and asked, "Do you know Jesus Christ?" I paused and said, "I know He is the Saviour of the world." "True," he replied, "but do you know He has saved you?" I answered, "I hope He has died to save me." He only added, "Do you know yourself?" I said, "I do." But I fear they were vain words.'[2]

Wesley is steadily learning. He refuses no guidance, but, with that clear and acute mind, he resolutely searches into all he is taught and winnows wheat from chaff. Coming back from Georgia, he writes: 'It is now two years and almost four months since I left my native country in order to teach the Georgian Indians the nature of Christianity. But what have I learned myself in the meantime? Why (what I least of all suspected), that I who went to America to convert others was never myself converted to God.' [He writes thirty years after, 'I am not sure of this.'] He goes on to say, 'The faith I want is' (years after he adds a note, 'the faith of a son') 'a sure trust and confidence in God, that, through the merits of Christ my sins are forgiven and I reconciled to the favour of God. . . . I want that faith that none can have without knowing that he hath it,' a faith that frees from sin, fear, doubt, and that witnesses 'with his spirit that he is a child of God.'[3]

In touch with the Moravians going out, in touch with them again when he comes home, 'in a state of spiritual discomfort and destitution,' he has learned some important truths. He has learned to preach 'faith' though he has it not. Böhler says, 'Preach faith till you have it, and then because you have it you will preach faith.' Wesley soon found he stumbled not at the preaching of faith. In his preaching he received proof of the instantaneousness of faith. Clifford, a prisoner under sentence of death, received deliverance for his soul. Wesley found scarce anything else, to his surprise, as he searched the Scriptures.

Wesley next learns that this faith is 'the free gift of God.' He renounces 'all dependence, in whole or part, upon my own works or righteousness'; and continually prays 'for this very thing, justifying saving faith, and full reliance on the blood of Christ shed for me; a trust in Him as my Christ, as my sole justification, sanctification, and redemption.'

It is now May 22nd, 1738. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, 'I had continual sorrow and heaviness of heart.' At 5 A.M. on the 24th Wesley reads the words, 'There are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: even that ye should be partakers of the divine nature.' A little later, as he goes out, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' At St. Paul's the anthem was, 'Out of the deep have I called unto Thee, O Lord.'

Then the *Journal* records the famous passage that puts the topstone upon his experience of deliverance, that gives him the full assurance of faith. 'In the evening I went very unwillingly to a society in Aldersgate Street, where one was reading Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. About a quarter before nine, while he was describing the change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ, I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation: and an assurance was given me, that He had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death. I began to pray with all my might for those who had in a more especial manner despitefully used me and

[1] *Fifty-three Sermons*, pp. 221, 222.
[2] *Journals*, February 7, 1736.
[3] *Ibid.* February 29, 1738.

persecuted me. I then testified openly to all there, what I now first felt in my heart. But it was not long before the enemy suggested, "This cannot be faith, for where is thy joy." Then was I taught that peace and victory over sin are essential to faith in the Captain of our salvation; but that, as to the transports of joy that usually attend the beginning of it, especially in those who have mourned deeply, God sometimes giveth, sometimes withholdeth them, according to the counsels of His own will.' Wesley's heart has its fluctuations like all other seekers'. While he never loses his assurance of salvation, resting his whole weight on God's word and Christ's work, he does, for a time, have 'fears within.' In his note on Ro 8^{16}, published sixteen years later, he says, 'Happy they who enjoy this clear and constant' (this direct witness of the Spirit). He was not long in finding his spiritual balance. The pendulum swung fairly evenly between the abiding desire of his believing heart and the abiding witness ('a testimony distinct from that of his own spirit or the testimony of a good conscience') of the Spirit that he was a child of God. His life kept time according to the will of God for the remaining fifty-three years, and his last words were an echo of the Aldersgate Street experience, 'The best of all is, God is with us.' Twenty-five days after his discovery of 'saving faith,' Wesley preached at St. Mary's, Oxford, and gave this clear and explicit definition. 'Christian faith, then, is not only an assent to the whole gospel of Christ, but also a full reliance on the blood of Christ; a trust in the merits of His life, death, and resurrection; a recumbency upon Him as our atonement and our life, as *given for us* and *living in us*; and in consequence hereof, a closing with Him, and cleaving to Him, as our "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption," or, in one word, our salvation.'[1]

Wesley's doctrine of assurance is an assurance of present pardon. That present and continued experience gave him and his followers the directness, the vigour, the conviction, the personal witness that was the conspicuous contribution of Methodism to religious life. Wesley's personal testimony, as well as the testimony of the fruit of his ministry, lays emphasis on this experience as the turning-point in his life. He says, 'From 1725 to 1729 I preached much, but saw no fruit of my labour . . . from 1729 to 1734, laying a deeper foundation of repentance, I saw a little fruit. But it was only a little; and no wonder: for I did not preach faith in the blood of the Covenant; from 1734 to 1738, speaking more of faith in Christ, I saw more fruit to my preaching; from 1738, speaking continually of Jesus Christ, laying Him only for the foundation of the whole building, making Him all in all, the first and the last . . . the "word of God ran" as fire among the stubble.'[2]

Wesley has taught us that assurance is more than merely intellectual assent. It is the soul consciously transformed by the passion of love. It is the first cry of the child after its consciousness of spiritual birth, 'Abba, Father.' It is the filial response to the witness of the Spirit of Sonship, of adoption, of justification. It is the continued voice of the child speaking to the Father, as the Spirit 'bearing witness' unfolds what sonship means to the believing heart. Assurance is the fruit, not the essence of faith. Wesley taught that the Spirit bears witness separately to our justification, adoption, and sanctification. He was always careful to emphasize that this was the privilege of all the children of God.

It was given in answer to the cry of the believing heart, though 'how' may never be understood. Wesley's own experience teaches us how hard it is for the intellect to learn that this assurance is altogether God's gift, and that He cannot bear witness with our spirit until we trust in Christ, Christ alone for salvation; and this the humblest child of God can do although he cannot explain one letter of the new spiritual alphabet he is learning.

The full assurance of faith, as taught by Wesley, safeguards both objective and subjective faith. It rests upon the objective faith. It looks back, to Calvary; and up, to Christ; and sees the Saviour. Then it looks in, and sees that the believer is a child of God—pardoned. The basis of the certainty rests securely on the revelation of the atoning work of Christ; on the fact of Christ, and on 'all that the Cross essentially implies.' The relation between objective and subjective assurance will vary much. As in Wesley's case, 'the implicit became the explicit.' As in the case of the pagan mobs to whom he preached there came a deep conviction of sin. They became assured of a real definite and inexorable God, who hated sin, but who had given His own Son that sin might be

[1] *Fifty-three Sermons*, pp. 3, 4.

[2] *Works*, viii. 468.

forgiven, and that a new life might be led. Whatever their vision of the Saviour, they received the assurance of pardon, and the subjective certitude led them to further objective certainty.

The quality of endurance of this assurance receives abundant testimony in the *Lives of Early Methodist Preachers*. One of the thirty-four 'helpers,' Christopher Hopper, aged 79, after fifty-six years in the Lord's service says, 'On this foundation all my hopes *are founded now*, and it does support me. I have not a doubt—no, not a shadow of a doubt; and as for the enemy I know not what has become of him.' Thomas Taylor, after fifty-five years of hard service, writes, 'I stand amazed at the goodness of God towards me.' Wesley's doctrine of assurance covers the whole of what salvation includes, past, present, and future. It rests, objectively, upon the truth of the Word of God; of the Resurrection of Christ—which is the surety of His power to save; and of the whole revelation from God. It rests upon the fact of the Risen Lord, on the combined proofs of the Word of God, of prayer, of the Church with its fellowship of the children of God, of the continuous witness of the Sacraments. The cumulative evidence of the seals without becomes the witness of the seal within. Subjectively it is the witness of the Spirit *to* the conscience, of justification; *with* the spirit, of adoption; *in* the soul, of sanctification. It is the assurance of faith for the present, of hope for the future, of understanding as underlying all. It is not in any way independent of the external seals and pledges. It receives its verification in the fruits of faith in daily life. There is the certitude of the inner man. 'Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance,' 1 Th 1^5 (πληροφορία, 'most certain confidence'—Grim); 'in full assurance (fulness, R.V.) of faith,' He 10^{22}; 'in full assurance (fulness, R.V.) of hope,' He 6^{11}; 'of the full assurance of understanding,' Col 2^2. There is also the expression of it in the outer life—there is a cheerful confidence, a holy boldness—a παρρησία for each πληροφορία in the New Testament; 'a boldness of faith,' He 4^{16}, 1 Jn 5^{14}; 'of hope,' He $10^{35\text{-}36}$, 1 Jn 2^{28}; 'of understanding,' 1 Tim 3^{13}, 2 Co 3^{12}.

This assurance may accompany saving faith; it may succeed it. It is not saving faith itself. It is the confirming, attesting, witness of the life—the assurance of Sonship. As in John's First Epistle the witnessing, indwelling, and renewing Spirit is often one and indistinguishable. The main point is that there is a *direct* witness of the Spirit, which is confirmed by the indirect witness of the conscience, on the evidence of a sincere life.

Wesley's doctrine of assurance is not visionary, fanciful, obscure. It is 'true' mysticism; it perfects and unfolds all the powers of the human spirit. To have an experimental acquaintance with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is a sure cure for all false forms of mysticism. Wesley broke with the Moravians because they undervalued the objective factors of Christianity. He was fully alive to the peril of that mysticism that sought to find absorption of the self in God. Wesley never undervalued man's individuality. He looked for all the marks that precede, accompany, and follow the true genuine testimony of the Spirit of God in the heart of the believer. Repentance, pardon, the new birth go before; joy in the Lord, humility, obedience accompany it; and the fruits of the Spirit follow it.

The authority of the Church as the conveyancer of the life in Christ was emphasized by Wesley. The new discovery of the authority of the individual heart came as a mental and moral shock to the whole corporate body of men. It quickened the intellect. Its effects have run on until, to-day, they have outrun the authority of the Church. The problem now is 'how to set the true limits to the individual!' The manward side of the value of individual experience has broadened out until the conception of the brotherhood of man has led him to forget his individual responsibility to God. We need to get back the Godward side of that great discovery. Man has claimed his own rights before giving 'unto God the things that are God's.' When we awaken to the misplacement of emphasis, and all that this misplacement entails, we shall also recover the essential truths that underly this doctrine of assurance—the authority of the Bible; the authority of the Church, 'the congregation of faithful men' (not the exaggerated authority of any section); the fact of God, of His holiness, His righteousness, His justice; the fact of the real judgment of God, the judgment now and the judgment to come; the fact of forgiveness, an abiding conscious witness in the soul of pardon, and power to live the new life; the true unfolding of individual life, the fact of all the infinite possi-

bilities of our complex individual existence that will develop into bud, and blossom, and fruit, as the Holy Spirit works in us, and through us, the will of God. John Wesley's doctrine of assurance still gives us the best working explanation of a forgiven heart, and the 'passion' of a renewed will that can 'publish to the sons of men the signs infallible.'

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ISAIAH.

Isaiah xl. 6–8.

'All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.'

1. A mysterious superhuman voice puts this cry into the prophet's lips. It is as though the rush and lapse of time itself became audible, and spoke its message to the thoughtless and fleeting generations of men. There are hours in life, solemn and critical for each of us, at which we are compelled again to hear it,—as when one year, or one century, passes into another, or when our dead pass from our side to their long home. The prophet's cry reverberates along the corridors of time from each generation and age to the next; our vanished years and the centuries of history take up the echo. They proclaim to us with one voice the transience of all earthly things, the abiding worth and undecaying power of the Word of the living God, and the safety and permanence alone of those hopes and interests of mankind which have their foundation and their warrant here. 'All flesh is grass'—brief and frail in duration as the green grass in yon burning eastern clime; and 'the goodliness thereof'—its bloom of beauty, its flush of pleasure, its pride of strength or wealth—more fleeting still, as the flower that withers while the grass is green! The inspired figure is touchingly reproduced by one of our English poets:

> Look at the fate of summer flowers,
> Which blow at daybreak, droop ere evensong;
> And grieved for their brief date, confess that ours,
> Measured by all we are and ought to be,
> Measured by all that trembling we foresee,
> Is not so long!

2. In contrast with the perishing life of the great Empire city and its vast populations, Isaiah points to 'the word of our God.' That Word, he says, will 'stand for ever.' While man, living in the flesh, with his finite being, his limited powers, his decaying strength, recalls the withering grass and the fading flower, the Word of our God rises up like corn in the ear, and is, as it were, embodied before the spiritual eye of man; it neither fades nor withers; it endures for ever; it justifies itself at the bar of history and throughout all time.

3. St. Peter detaches this text from its historical setting, and gives it a universal application. When he reminds Christians that they are born again, and that a regenerate man has a new life and a new standard of duty before him, he adds that this new birth has been effected, 'not by corruptible seed, but by incorruptible, by the word of God, that liveth and abideth for ever.' And then he goes on to quote Isaiah with such variations as Apostles, conscious of their own inspiration, often felt at liberty to make when citing the Old Testament. 'All flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And,' adds St. Peter, as if to prevent the quotation from suggesting nothing but historical or antiquarian lessons to his readers, 'this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.'

I.

The Decay of Nature.

1. The simile has a twofold force. It justifies, at first sight, and to a certain extent, the sympathy with human life, with its freshness, variety, beauty, which was felt by captive Israel. What is more beautiful than a single blade of grass, if we look

steadily at it, and if we do not put our foot on it, just because, as has been said, 'there are millions of other blades of grass close by'? There it is, waving gently in the wind, inimitable in its subtle and delicate texture, in its grace, its movement. Do what we will, we cannot reproduce that blade of grass, we cannot even make a copy of it; it is as much beyond our skill as the sun himself. And how mysterious a thing is this blade of grass! When we cross-question ourselves, and have put aside the superficial trivialities that occur to us at first, what do we really know about it? How did it come to be there? It grew from a seed. Why should it grow? What do we mean by 'growth'? What growth is in itself we know not; but we can understand that it is a subtle and energetic force which a granite mountain, for instance, does not contain within itself, and which makes the blade of grass a much higher thing in the scale of being than is the granite mountain. We may think little of growth because we are so familiar with it. But growth, wherever we find it, is a profound mystery; it implies the active energy of life. We men, whatever we have besides, share this faculty of growth with the humblest blade of grass on which we tread; and we are very far from being dishonoured when our life is compared to a thing so full of wonder and beauty.

The goodliness of life is goodly. We need not scorn it because of its frailty, nor trample on the summer flowers because they fade. There is nothing in the Word of God, nothing in the seriousness of religion, which teaches us to despise the wholesome joys of natural life. Oh the goodliness of this fair earth, full in all its regions of the riches of the Lord! Oh the mystery and the glory of starlit skies, the grandeur of mountain and ocean, the splendours of science and of art, the teeming various life that fills land and sea and air! And the goodliness of this our human existence—of childhood with its exquisite freshness and innocent mirth, of youth with its buoyancy and ardour, of manhood with its strength and courage and success, of old age with its chastened affections and ripe wisdom and clustering honours! How much is still left to us, how much is restored by God's pardoning grace, that is very good! How vast the resources of the great Maker and Lord of creation, that He can afford to lavish this wealth of adornment and delight on things which seem born only to die,—that He can 'so clothe the grass which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven!'[1]

2. But the prophet refers to the grass as an emblem of the perishable and the perishing. In looking at it we look on what is at best a vanishing form, ready, almost ere it is mature, to be resolved into its elements, and to sink back into the soil whence it grew. 'The breath of the Lord,' says the prophet, 'has blown upon it.' The action of God the Creator upon the world is, in the Old Testament, often ascribed to His Breath or Spirit pervading His works, and creating, sustaining, destroying life. Of this the emblem and manifestation is the wind; the heavy breathing, as it were, of nature. The Breath of God is, then, in such passages as this, God's action upon nature, whether to create or to destroy; and Isaiah insists that death does not overtake either animals or herbs simply in consequence of the chemical solvents which they contain, but because He who, in His freedom, gave the gift of life, now withdraws freely what He gave; because He dissolves, as He created, by an act of His will. According to the prophet, death, in its calmest and in its most terrible forms, is always arresting life by the fiat of God. 'The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because the breath of the Lord bloweth upon it.'

Only within the last week or so, in my own county of Kent, these very words were made wonderfully clear. The whole country round was covered with the blossoms of the fruit trees, and though their blossoms remained longer than people thought they could have remained, because the weather happened to be colder than usual, and the sun could not shine upon them sufficiently, when there came a few days of sunshine, the very warmth which enabled them to live caused them to fade away, because 'the Spirit of the Lord' had blown upon them.[2]

3. The words of the herald are to be applied, in the first place, to nations; but they may be applied also to individual men.

(1) *Nations.*—The immediate purpose of the words is to reassure the Jews of the Captivity. There they were in Babylon, far from their home, surrounded by the imposing fabric of a great empire, crushed into silent submission by its power, awed, at times half-fascinated, by its splendour. It was to men whose eyes were resting on this scene of magnificence and power that Isaiah spoke, out of another land and an earlier age, the solemn words, 'All flesh is grass, and all the beauty thereof as the flower of the field.' The modern traveller tells us that the 'beauty of the Chaldee's excellency' has 'become heaps'; that her walls have 'fallen,' been 'thrown down,' and 'broken utterly'; that the very site is a wilderness;

[1] George G. Findlay.

[2] J. G. Wood.

that the 'wild beasts of the desert lie there,' and 'the owls dwell there'; that the natives regard the site as haunted by evil spirits, so that 'neither will the Arab pitch tent nor the shepherd fold sheep there'; that, in a word, prophecy has been literally fulfilled. The beauty of human life in this, for many centuries its princely centre, was, after all, but 'as the flower of the field.' 'The grass withereth, the flower fadeth.'

The simile is elsewhere used by Isaiah in his message to Hezekiah, to describe the completeness of the destruction of the Jewish towns by the Assyrian Sennacherib's invading army.

> Their inhabitants were men of small power.
> . . . . . .
> They were as the grass of the field,
> And as the green herb,
> As the grass on the housetops,
> And as corn blasted before it is grown up.

Nothing is more astonishing than the way in which these feeble solitary men, belonging to a despised people—and themselves often despised amongst their people—confronted the empires of their day and all that proud and ancient civilization. Nothing is more astonishing than the political language of their prophecies,—unless it be the completeness of their fulfilment. Egypt, Tyre, Nineveh, Babylon—names famed then for everything venerable in antiquity, rich in commerce, terrible in war, whose fleets covered the seas and the tramp of whose armies shook the earth when our ancestors were painted savages—where are they, what are they now? They are just what these men foresaw and what we read in their pages, 'a habitation of dragons, a joy of wild asses'; these have been, and are largely at the present time, amongst the most oppressed and impoverished and desolate regions of the earth. Because those great world-empires were built on violence and wrong, and were corrupted by vile idolatries; therefore the prophets of God foresaw their overthrow, and one after another they fell into decrepitude and ruin. He 'blew upon them, and they withered; and the whirlwind carried them away like stubble.'[1]

In Gn 10[22] Elam appears as the son of Shem—but here was a difficulty. The Elamites of history were not a Semitic, but an Aryan people, and their language was Aryan. Even Professor Hommel, in defending the ancient Hebrew tradition, thought he had to admit an error here. But was there? A French expedition went out to excavate Susa, the capital of Elam, and below the remains of the historical Elam discovered bricks and other remains of an older civilization, with Babylonian inscriptions showing the people to be of Semitic stock; so Elam was, after all, the son of Shem. The passing of one people after another as inhabitants of Susa very strongly resembles the growth of grass and flowers—crop after crop—season after season—but underlying all, the word of the Lord stands unchangeable.

[1] George G. Findlay.

(2) *Men.*—We come now to the more familiar application of the seer's words—the fleeting and unsubstantial tenure of human life. It is a world-old and a threadbare theme, yet one which each open grave, each sudden death, each tale of wide-spread disaster, every tidings of some spread of pestilence brings home to us with a force and a freshness always new. It comes back upon us almost as it must have come home to those who first realized it. It recurs again and again, as we all know, in the whole cycle of human literature. The very image of the text, repeated now by one psalmist and another, now by a patriarch, now by an apostle, is but the Eastern echo of the simple pathos with which Homer compares the passing generations to the leaves which the winds of autumn scatter on the earth.

Even had Babylon been chartered with the promise of eternal youth, Babylonians would have died one after another. That outward form of man's life, which we name civilization, and which exerts so immense an empire over our imagination, does not count for much in the true life of man. The individual man would still be as the grass which withereth, even if the political society to which he belonged were strictly imperishable. In this respect there was no difference between the courtiers of Nebuchadnezzar and the broken-hearted captives who, by the waters of Babylon, sat down and wept when they remembered Zion.

Marie Bashkirtseff, a Russian girl of splendid genius, 'with the ambition of a Cæsar,' her biographer writes, 'smouldering under her crop of red hair,' is dying at twenty-four with less faith than a pagan, and she writes in her journal: 'O to think that we live but once, and that life is so short! When I think of it, I am like one possessed, and my brain seethes with despair!'

II.

The Vitality of God's Word.

1. By 'the word of our God' Isaiah means, in the first instance, the Word of promise uttered in the desert by the inspired Voice. The promise of the return from Babylon, the promise of the presence of Israel's Redeemer, would be fulfilled. The conquerors and oppressors of Israel would pass away. With this imperishable Word of God Israel may comfort himself in his captive hours. The hour of Babylon's fall would be the hour of Israel's liberty. The promise of deliverance rested

on a Will more durable than the walls of Babylon, more invincible than the hosts of Nebuchadnezzar. Whatever present appearances might be; however great the might of Babylon, however few and feeble the heralds of the Divine Word; the one was human, and therefore transient, the other eternal because Divine.

A hundred years ago Lord Chesterfield, while visiting in Paris, was entertained by a lady of distinction, but a bitter foe of Christianity. She said, 'My lord, I am informed that your English Parliament is composed of five or six hundred of the most profound and brilliant thinkers. Will you explain to me why, under their authority, the Bible is still recognized in the legislation of your country, and the obsolete religion of the Nazarene is maintained as the State religion?' He answered, 'Madam, this is a mere temporary makeshift; we are casting about for something better, and when that is discovered the Bible and Christianity must go.'

2. 'But the word of the Lord'—in St. Peter's sense of the term as well as Isaiah's—'endureth for ever.' How do we know that? Not in the same way, certainly, as we know the universality of death. We know it to be true if we believe two things: first, that God, the Perfect Moral Being, exists; secondly, that He has spoken to man. If He is Eternal, that which He proclaims as His Truth and Will will bear on it the mark of His Eternity; if He is true, that which He speaks will bear the impress of His faithfulness.

(1) The Word of our God, which is the gospel, is a source of hope and comfort because *it brings before us the Great Loving Redeemer*, who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for us. It tells us of one who 'suffered being tempted, that He might be able to succour them that are tempted.' It points us to Him who died for us, 'that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage' (He 2^{15}). It tells us of One 'who was wounded for our transgressions, who was bruised for our iniquities,' and who could say to the trembling soul, 'Fear not; I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death' (Rev 1^{18}). It sets before us the great Redeemer standing by the open tomb of Lazarus, and speaking words of comfort to the weeping sister, 'Thy brother shall rise again.' 'I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die.' That was the faith which enabled the patriarch Job, amid all his sorrows, to say, 'But I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another.' It was faith in this living Redeemer that enabled the Apostle Paul to say, 'We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens' (2 Co 5^{1}). It was this faith that enabled the same Apostle to say, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.'

(2) But, again, the Word of God, which endureth for ever, brings comfort and peace because *it is full of exceeding great and precious promises*, upon which we lean, and through which we are strengthened and refreshed. 'My heart and my flesh faileth,' he often groans, but he can add in faith, 'God is the strength of my life, and my portion for ever.' And these promises contained in God's Word are 'all yea and amen in Christ Jesus,' sealed and ratified with the blood of His Atonement, and 'written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.' We need that hope, for we all do fade as a leaf; but God's Word is fitted to the state in which it finds the weary soul, and cheers him with promises of grace and strength in time of need.

What a multitude of meetings, such as none can number, have taken place between men and God through the Word! And just as, in the world, there are certain towns and cities characterized more than others by meetings between parted friends, such as seaports where steamers from the Colonies or foreign parts arrive, so, in God's Word, there are great texts, golden texts, whither many anxious, needy, sinful men and women have come, and there found God as the strength of their life and their portion for ever. There are grand, heart-filling texts, where many, as John Knox put it, have first cast anchor, and have realized how true, in the highest sense may be the poet's line:

Fill my empty heart with a word.

3. But what benefit, it might be said, will it be, even though the Word stand for ever, if men come and go, if all flesh is grass, if we are only

like the grass that grows and withers? What benefit will the Abiding Word be to us in our fleeting life? Ah, but that is only one aspect of human life. It is life in connexion with the world that is fleeting; but there is also a life in connexion with the Word. The Old Testament says: 'All flesh is grass.' The New Testament goes even further, and says, 'The world passeth away.' But, if the New Testament goes beyond the Old in its declaration of the temporary nature of all things earthly, it goes beyond the Old, too, in its manifestation of the permanent view of life. The Old Testament says, 'The word of God abideth.' The New says, 'He that doeth the will of God abideth.' It has a clear and triumphant note for the individual. Yes, if, even as regards the grass, according to the song,

Ilka blade o' grass keps [catches] its ain drap o' dew,

how much more may mortal man find, in the eternal Word that which shall be as the dew to his soul, the refreshing, transfiguring element, not renewing for a brief day only, but enabling to live after the power of an endless life!

Mrs. Carlyle, in one of her letters, writes of revisiting her birthplace (Haddington) after many years' absence. Looking at the signs over the shop-doors as she walked along the streets, she could see but few of the old familiar names. 'Almost all the names had disappeared from the signs, and I found them on the tombstones in the churchyard.' But nothing can supersede the Sign of the Cross. *It* has been connected with the tomb, too, but it is no tombstone it is written upon. It is just because that Name has been connected with the tomb that it lives, and will ever live.

There is in Northern India a spacious city, built by a Mogul Emperor for his own glory, Fatehpur Sikri. It is now absolutely deserted by man. Over a vast gateway in the silent walls is carved an Arabic inscription, which purports to preserve, strange to say, an extra-Scriptural utterance of our blessed Lord's:

> Jesus, on whom be peace, hath said,
> This world is but a bridge; pass over;
> But build not thy dwelling there.

So let us pass on and over, alert and occupied all the way, yet with heart and hope ever in sober earnest looking forward to the life of the world to come.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London.

I.

1. The one question with which this article is concerned is: Whether, and how far, the doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds, as they are accepted in the Christian Church, can be regarded by us to-day as adequate and satisfactory. We are not now concerned with these creeds in their historical function as standards of orthodoxy, or as weapons against heresy, except only in so far as these standpoints are necessary to our historical interpretation of them. We may now be of opinion that it is not by such means that Christian faith is to be preserved and defended in our own day; and we may even venture the conjecture that Christendom was divided and so weakened by these attempts to enforce uniformity of belief in the days of old. For our present purpose we must consider these ancient symbols from three points of view—personal faith, historical fact, and metaphysical formula. Do the contents of these creeds express personal faith as we to-day conceive it? Do they accord with historical fact as modern scholarship establishes it? Do they in the metaphysical formulæ employed satisfy the philosophical thought of the modern world? Must Christianity regard itself in its thinking on the object of its faith, the person and work of Jesus the Christ our Lord, bound by the fetters, kept within the borders of the thought of the early Christian centuries; or should it here, too, claim the freedom wherewith the Son maketh free?

2. A glance at the history, although it must be as brief as possible, is inevitable.

(i.) The Apostles' Creed in its present form is first found in the writings of Pirminius, in a manuscript belonging to the eighth century, and so may be dated about 750 A.D. One change has been introduced since: 'ad inferna' has become 'ad inferos' in the fifth article. But the creed can be traced backwards through Rufinus, about 400 A.D.;

Augustine, A.D. 393; and Marcellus of Ancyra, A.D. 341, to Tertullian, A.D. 210, and Irenæus, A.D. 185. It is now generally agreed by scholars that it is an expansion of the Roman Baptismal Creed. M'Giffert denies that it can be traced further back than the middle of the second century, and maintains that it was directed against the heresy of Marcion. It is neither apostolic nor is it a complete confession of what the Christian believes.

(ii.) The Nicene Creed was adopted at the Council of Nicæa in A.D. 325, in condemnation of the heresy of Arius. It is a development of the Creed of Cæsarea, which its bishop, Eusebius, presented to the Council. The most important differences are these: The clause πρωτότοκον πασης κτίσεως is omitted as capable of an Arian interpretation; and there are added to exclude Arianism the clauses τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρί. One clause in the Nicene Creed τὰ τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ is taken from the Creed found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. This Cæsarean Creed was also an expansion of a much shorter and simpler baptismal formula, such as is found in the lectures of St. Cyril as in use in the Church at Jerusalem.

(iii.) What is, however, generally known as the Nicene Creed is that which is commonly said to have been formed by Gregory Nyssen, and to have been adopted and authoritatively sanctioned by the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381). On this latter point, however, doubts have been raised (Heurtley, *De Fide et Symbol*, p. 19). 'What is called the Creed of Constantinople, however, did not emanate from the Council. The foundation of the Creed so called was a confession composed by Cyril of Jerusalem, prior to his being made bishop, which was in 350. In the existing form of the Creed, it is almost identical with a baptismal symbol recommended by Epiphanius as early as 374. It is probable that Cyril himself had enlarged this symbol for the benefit of his people by introducing the passages from the Nicene Creed which formed a part of it' (Fisher's *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 145). It was accepted by the Council of Chalcedon as the creed of the Council of Constantinople along with the Nicene Creed, so that it has 'the full sanction of a General Council' (Heurtley). The chief difference is that the short clause in the eighth article καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον is expanded in order to condemn the heresy of Macedonius and his followers, nicknamed the 'Pneumatomachians' because they regarded the Holy Ghost as a creature subordinate to the Son. The articles on the Church, baptism, the resurrection, and eternal life were also added. It is in connexion with the article on the Holy Ghost that the most serious doctrinal difference between East and West emerged. The procession of the Spirit is from the Father. In the West the *Filioque* clause, conjoining the Son with the Father, was added; but the date of the addition is quite uncertain.

(iv.) In the Constantinopolitan Creed the trinitarian doctrine is formulated, of which the Athanasian Creed gives a much more elaborate development. There is still controversy regarding the history of this document. It is certain that its author was not Athanasius, as it is of Latin and not Greek origin, and shows the influence of the teaching of Augustine. It is expressly directed against the heresy of Apollinaris in its assertion of the perfect manhood of Jesus: its clauses too may be regarded as directed against both Nestorianism in asserting the unity of the person, and Eutychianism in denying the confusion of the substances. It has been dated as early as the fifth century, and as late as the ninth, and various authors have been suggested; but no certainty on these points can at present be reached. It is probable that it was composed in Gaul. It is a sermon rather than a creed, and comes to us from one single author, and not a Council. It makes salvation depend on acceptance of its elaborate and complicated doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation; it is theology, not religion.

(v.) The Creed of the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451 may be regarded as completing this theological development. Its definition of faith is not put forward as a new creed, but as an explanation of the Creed of Nicæa, and of Constantinople, to condemn the errors of Eutyches, and also of Nestorius, who had already been condemned at the Council of Ephesus in 431. The perfect divinity is asserted against Arius, condemned at Nicæa in 325; the perfect humanity against Apollinaris, whose doctrine, without mention of his name, was condemned at the Synod of Alexandria in 362, the Synod of Rome in 377, and the Council of Constantinople in 381. Against his view that the divine Logos filled the place of the rational soul in Christ, Christ is said to consist ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος. Against Nestorius

the Council confesses him ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, Υἱόν, Κύριον. About the clause directed against Eutyches there is some doubt. 'The Greek text, as it stands in the record of the Council, is ἐκ δύο φύσεων,' but it need hardly be pointed out that Eutyches could have accepted that phrase. The text generally adopted is ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, words which assert the permanence of the two natures. 'Dr. Routh conjectures that the original was ἐκ δύο φύσεων καὶ ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, which certainly is more in keeping with the mind of the Council.' The adverbs ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως (without confusion, with conversion) are against Eutyches, the adverbs ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως (without division, never to be separated) against Nestorius.

3. Into the subsequent history of the Christological controversy it is not necessary for our purpose here to enter. Nestorianism was driven beyond the borders of the Roman Empire. The bishop and others who would not accept the condemnation of Nestorius, fled to Persia, and built up the Syrian Church, 'which, in numbers and learning and missionary zeal combined, surpassed all others and was till the fourteenth century the Church of the East *par excellence*, reaching far into India and China' (*Nestorius and his Teaching*, by Bethune-Baker). The recent discovery of a work of Nestorius, *The Bazaar of Heraclides*, proves that neither Nestorius nor his followers denied, or intended to deny, the unity of the person of Christ, and that he was the victim of the unscrupulous ambition, rivalry, and hostility of Cyril of Alexandria, whose own doctrine was consistently developed by Eutyches. His *monophysitism* was not crushed out by the Council of Chalcedon, and it survives in the Coptic Church in Egypt, in Abyssinia, in the Jacobite Church of Syria, and in a measure in Armenia (Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, p. 568). If we further remember that Arian missionaries carried the gospel to the Germanic peoples, we shall be justified in concluding that, while we may approve the decisions of these successive Councils in principle generally, yet we cannot recognize so absolute an identity of these creeds with the common Christian faith as to regard them above examination and criticism.

In the Study.

THE HOME UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

Every trade and every country should make progress; but no country or trade should make progress by revolution. In the trade of bookselling there has been a revolution in our day; and it is due especially to two causes, the increase of circulating libraries and the issue of reprints. Revolution is bad; from the revolution in bookselling authors and booksellers have suffered together. Now many things may be said in favour of circulating libraries and cheap reprints; but this always remains, that no man or woman likely to derive benefit from the reading of a book will ever fail to find a book to read, and no one will derive lasting good from any book that has cost him nothing. The circulating library is with us and will remain. Can nothing be done to get rid of the cheap reprint?

The best thing to do is to publish original books of as much worth at as little money. The publishers have begun to do that. Some time ago Messrs. Williams & Norgate announced the preparation of a series of volumes of something like 250 pages each, to be published in cloth at one shilling net, every one of which should be original. They have now issued forty of these volumes. Let us attempt to appreciate their worth, and consider the probability of their taking the place of the objectionable reprint.

In a singularly clear and straightforward statement the publishers say (1) that every volume is new and written specially for the series; (2) that every subject is of living and permanent interest, and that the books are written for the general reader as well as the student; (3) that each volume is complete and independent, but that the series has been planned so as to form a comprehensive survey of modern knowledge; (4) that every volume is written by a recognized authority on its

subject, and that the *Home University Library of Modern Knowledge* is edited by Professor Gilbert Murray and Mr. H. A. L. Fisher of Oxford, Professor J. Arthur Thomson of Aberdeen, and Professor W. T. Brewster of Columbia University, New York.

The volumes are of three kinds.

First there is the volume which offers a bird's-eye view of knowledge over some large field. In this class we place Professor J. Arthur Thomson's *Introduction to Science*; *The History of England*, by Professor A. F. Pollard; *Rome*, by Mr. W. Warde Fowler; Dr. W. S. Bruce's *Polar Exploration*; and *Landmarks in French Literature*, by Mr. G. L. Strachan.

Next there is the volume which takes up a more limited subject and gives a fuller account of it. This class includes those which handle new sciences. On such a subject we look for a fairly complete history and a clear indication of the lines on which the study is likely to make progress. A good example is Mr. R. R. Marett's book on *Anthropology*. This book is quite sufficient for the purpose of showing what that new science is, what are its objects and limits, and what is to be gained by a study of it. Mr. Marett writes with clearness and force. He never forgets that his book has to be intelligible to the unlearned and yet to pass the scrutiny of the scholar. And he finishes it off with a well-selected bibliography and an index. Anthropology touches Religion on one side and marches with Psychology on another; and the students of both these sciences will find Mr. Marett's book illustrative. Take this paragraph:

'Public safety is construed by the ruder type of man not so much in terms of freedom from physical danger—unless such a danger, the onset of another tribe, for instance, is actually imminent—as in terms of freedom from spiritual, or mystic, danger. The fear of ill-luck, in other words, is the bogey that haunts him night and day. Hence his life is enmeshed, as Dr. Frazer puts it, in a network of taboos. A taboo is anything that one must not do lest ill-luck befall. And ill-luck is catching, like an infectious disease. If my next-door neighbour breaks a taboo, and brings down a visitation on himself, depend upon it some of its unpleasant consequences will be passed on to me and mine. Hence, if some one has committed an act that is not merely a crime but a sin, it is every one's concern to wipe out that sin; which is usually done by wiping out the sinner. Mobbish feeling always inclines to violence. In the mob, as a French psychologist has said, ideas neutralize each other, but emotions aggrandize each other. Now war-feeling is a mobbish experience that, I daresay, some of my readers have tasted; and we have seen how it leads the unorganized levy of a savage tribe to make short work of the coward and traitor. But war-fever is a mild variety of mobbish experience as compared with panic in any form, and with superstitious panic most of all. Being attacked in the dark, as it were, causes the strongest to lose their heads.'

In this second class we should place *Climate and Weather*, by Professor H. N. Dickson; *The Science of Wealth*, by Mr. J. A. Hobson; *Psychical Research*, by Mr. W. F. Barrett; and *The Socialist Movement*, by Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald.

But there is a third class. The editors have had the courage to recommend that some subjects of quite limited extent but wide interest should be included in the Library. Thus, besides the general survey of the history of Philosophy, there is a volume by the Hon. Bertrand Russell on *The Problems of Philosophy*; there is a complete volume by Professor J. J. Findlay on *The School*, one by Mr. F. W. Hirst on *The Stock Exchange*, and one by Professor L. T. Hobhouse on *Liberalism*. But the clearest example of this type of volume is Mr. John Masefield's *Shakespeare*. For it is not a biography of Shakespeare or a criticism of Shakespeare's work. It is an argument for the proper production of Shakespeare's plays on the modern stage. With this object ever in view Mr. Masefield says not a little about the psychology and ethics of the plays, and something even of the life of their author. But the book is really a monograph on a very limited subject. And we should be glad to see the Library contain many more such monographs.

In these days every man has to be both a specialist and a universalist. If any man reads one of these volumes and follows it up with the reading of the volumes recommended in its bibliography, he will in time become a specialist in that subject. If he reads all the volumes he will be a universalist. And this is the demand that is made on us—we must know something of everything, and we must know everything of something.

DESERT CATHAY.

'Not far from Tun-huang, the chief oasis still surviving within this western extremity of the ancient "Great Wall," lies the sacred site of the "Thousand Buddhas." Buddhist piety of early times has here honey-combed the rock walls of a true Thebais with hundreds of cave temples, once richly decorated with frescoes and stucco sculptures, and still objects of worship. Here I had the good fortune in the spring of 1907 to gain access to a great deposit of ancient manuscripts and art relics which had lain hidden and perfectly protected in a walled-up rock chapel for about nine hundred years. The story how I secured here twenty-four cases heavy with manuscript treasures rescued from that strange place of hiding, and five more filled with paintings, embroideries, and similar remains of Buddhist art, has been characterized by a competent observer as a particularly dramatic and fruitful incident in the history of archæological discovery. Faithful reproductions in colour of some of the fine paintings here recovered make it easy to appreciate the artistic value of these "finds," and to recognize how the influence of Græco-Buddhist models victoriously spread itself to the Far East. A new chapter may be said to have been opened in the history of Eastern art; but it will take long years of study before all its problems can be elucidated, and probably longer still before all that is of historical and philological interest can be extracted from those thousands of manuscripts in Chinese, Sanskrit, Uigur, Tibetan, "unknown"-Central-Asian languages, and the rest.'

Thus Mr. Aurel Stein announces the great discovery which he made in the course of that famous journey which is described in *Ruins of Desert Cathay* (Macmillan; 2 vols., 42s. net). Let us hear the story as he tells it in the second volume.

'I had scarcely returned to the shelter of Tun-huang from the fascinations and trials of the ancient desert border when my eyes began to turn eagerly towards the cave temples of the "Thousand Buddhas" at the foot of the barren dune-covered hills to the south-east. It was the thought of their sculptures and frescoes which had first drawn me to this region. But since my visit to the site in March, and the information then gathered about the great collection of ancient manuscripts discovered in one of the temples, the antiquarian attraction of the sacred caves had, of course, vastly increased. Eager as I was to commence operations at once, I had to contain myself in patience.

'Just after my return to Tun-huang the annual pilgrimage to the shrines commenced, and it did not need the polite hints of my Amban friends to convince me that this was not the best time for a move to the site. The great fête, a sort of religious fair, was said to have drawn thither fully ten thousand of the pious Tun-huang people, and from the endless string of carts I saw a few days later returning laden with peasants and their gaily-decked women-folk, this estimate of the popular concourse seemed scarcely exaggerated. I knew enough of Indian Tirthas to realize that such an occasion was better for studying modern humanity than for searching out things of the past. So my start had to be postponed for five days.

'At last, accompanied only by Chiang, I went to the Temple. The priest summoned up courage to open before me the rough door closing the narrow entrance which led from the side of the broad front passage into the rock-carved recess, on a level of about four feet above the floor of the former. The sight of the small room disclosed was one to make my eyes open wide. Heaped up in layers, but without any order, there appeared in the dim light of the priest's little lamp a solid mass of manuscript bundles rising to a height of nearly ten feet, and filling, as subsequent measurement showed, close on 500 cubic feet. The area left clear within the room was just sufficient for two people to stand in. It was manifest that in this "black hole" no examination of the manuscripts would be possible, and also that the digging out of all its contents would cost a good deal of physical labour.

'The first bundles which emerged from that "black hole" consisted of thick rolls of paper about one foot high, evidently containing portions of canonical Buddhist texts in Chinese translations. All were in excellent preservation and yet showed in paper, arrangement, and other details, unmistakable signs of great age. The jointed strips of strongly made and remarkably tough and smooth yellowish paper, often ten yards or more long, were neatly rolled up, after the fashion of Greek papyri, over small sticks of hard wood sometimes having carved or inlaid end knobs. All showed signs of having been much read and handled; often the protecting outer fold, with the silk tape

which had served for tying up the roll, had got torn off. Where these covering folds were intact it was easy for the Ssŭ-yeh to read off the title of the Sutra, the chapter number, etc.

'Mixed up with the Chinese bundles there came to light Tibetan texts also written in roll form, though with clearly marked sections, as convenience of reading required in the case of a writing running in horizontal lines, not in vertical columns like Chinese. I could not doubt that they contained portions of the great canonical collections now known as the Tanjur and Kanjur. In the first rapid examination Chiang failed to discover colophons giving exact dates of the writing in any of the Chinese rolls, and owing to their length a complete unfolding would have required much time. So I had reason to feel doubly elated when, on the reverse of a Chinese roll, I first lighted upon a text written in that cursive form of Indian Brahmi script with which the finds of ancient Buddhist texts at sites of the Khotan region had rendered me familiar. Here was indisputable proof that the bulk of the manuscripts deposited went back to the time when Indian writing and some knowledge of Sanskrit still prevailed in Central-Asian Buddhism. With such evidence clearly showing the connection which once existed between these religious establishments and Buddhist learning as transplanted to the Tarim Basin, my hopes rose greatly for finds of direct importance to Indian and western research.

'All the manuscripts seemed to be preserved exactly in the same condition they were in when deposited. Some of the bundles were carelessly fastened with only rough cords and without an outer cloth wrapper; but even this had failed to injure the paper. Nowhere could I trace the slightest effect of moisture. And, in fact, what better place for preserving such relics could be imagined than a chamber carved in the live rock of these terribly barren hills, and hermetically shut off from what moisture, if any, the atmosphere of this desert valley ever contained? Not in the driest soil could relics of a ruined site have so completely escaped injury as they had here in a carefully selected rock chamber where, hidden behind a brick wall and protected by accumulated drift sand, these masses of manuscripts had lain undisturbed for centuries.'

That is enough to whet the appetite. Mr. Stein has a leisurely way of telling his story. But so all good story-tellers have. And no one will grudge waiting for him. For the story he tells in these two magnificent volumes is great beyond belief, and it has never been told before. What we have quoted is a mere episode. It is the most startling episode perhaps, and the episode which will give the journey its undying interest. But the journey itself is great. New regions are made accessible to the reader (not yet to the traveller, unless he has Mr. Stein's resource), and they are regions worth adding to one's knowledge.

The volumes, we have said, are magnificent. Even Messrs. Macmillan, easily first in the publication of travel, never surpassed this in workmanship. The illustrations are quite countless, and a very large number of them are printed in the most exquisite colours. The maps also are finished in a way that would have been impossible a few years ago. In human interest, in scientific worth, in artistic beauty, it will be difficult indeed to find a book surpassing this.

AMONG THE ESKIMOS.

Among the Eskimos of Labrador, by Mr. S. K. Hutton, M.B. (Seeley, Service & Co.; 16s. net), gives us a picture of the ways and thoughts of that wonderful folk which is not inferior in sympathetic insight to anything that has been written by Dr. Grenfell. The Eskimos have shared the glamour which falls round Arctic Exploration. But they have a fascination of their own. Every man who comes into living contact with them, however he may at first feel repulsion, at the last succumbs to their kind-heartedness, and henceforth lives to speak their praises.

Nor is it necessary to spend a winter among snow and ice in order to love the Eskimos. It is enough to read so simply fresh and attractive a book as this. Every detail of the daily life of this primitive people is told, and every detail bears telling. The book is well furnished with vivid pictures, but they are not necessary: Mr. Hutton's pen is better than his camera.

And it is not the daily life of the Eskimos only that we find described. There are adventures enough to satisfy the appetite of a schoolboy. Is not the author something of a schoolboy himself? How otherwise could he throw his whole soul into the description of a sweeping tornado or a successful walrus hunt?

GREECE AND BABYLON.

The progress made by the study of Religion is one of the most striking features of the first decade of the twentieth century. It is more than striking; it is astounding. Right on to the end of the nineteenth century the comparative study of Religion was regarded with dislike. It was not that there was any fear of Christianity being found unworthy of comparison; it was that a certain reverence for the things of Christ made men unwilling to place Christianity in comparison with other religions of the world, or even sometimes to admit that the other religions were in any proper sense worth calling religions. It seemed to not a few as if it were an attempt to reduce Christ to the level of Confucius. But, in spite of that dislike, the study of Religion made progress. And now there is no science that can claim to produce a more abundant literature.

There are two ways of approaching this study. One way is to select a book, written by one who is conversant with the science as a whole, but who has made some particular department his own. Such a book is Dr. J. A. MacCulloch's *Religion of the Celts*. The mastery of the Celtic Religion will give confidence. It is the experience of students of the Bible that the thorough study of one book, however small, forms a good basis from which to proceed to the study of the whole Bible. The other way is to make at once a comparison between one religion and another. And for this method no better book will be found than Dr. Farnell's *Greece and Babylon* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d.).

Whatever method of approach is adopted, the important thing is not to learn what will have to be unlearned. On no subject has more been written that is loose and unreliable. Dr. Farnell is altogether trustworthy. And his trustworthiness is due not entirely to the range and severity of his knowledge, but also to his caution and his candour. Where the evidence will not endure conviction, he says so; when he is convinced, the conviction is likely to stand.

It is only two or at most three months since Dr. James Lindsay published a volume of 'New Essays, Literary and Philosophical.' This month he has published a volume of *Literary Essays* (Blackwood; 3s. 6d. net). The topics are Goethe as Philosopher, the Poetry of Lowell, Hamlet as Thinker, Milton on the Nativity, and Biographical Literature. The last seems to have the keenest interest at the moment. And Dr. Lindsay does not disdain to tell us what are the best biographies in the language. But his chief object is to estimate the value of biographical writing for instruction in the making of character.

Under the editorship of Mr. Oliphant Smeaton, Messrs. Dent are publishing a series of volumes with the general title of 'The Channels of English Literature.' One of the volumes has been written by Professor James Seth. Its title is *English Philosophers and Schools of Philosophy* (5s. net).

It is a volume which will attract the attention of the serious student of English literature by its very appearance, for the page is broad, the type is close, and the printing is clear. It is evident at first sight that there is a good deal in it, and it seems to say that ours will be the fault if we do not take something out of it.

The distinguishing feature of the book, the feature which distinguishes it from other histories of English philosophy, is that in it English philosophy is treated as a form of English literature. But what does that mean? Does it mean that only those philosophers are included who wrote in such a way that their writing is called literature? Evidently it does not mean that, for all the philosophers are here: not only Bacon, but also Bentham; not only Hume, but also Ferrier. Does it mean, then, that certain writers are included who are literary men first and only philosophers afterwards? It does not mean that either, for Carlyle and Matthew Arnold are kept out. What it means is this: in the opinion of Professor Seth, English philosophy is entitled to be called literature from the beginning of it to the present time, for the English philosophers have qualities of style which entitle them to rank among the masters of English prose. In short, Professor Seth treats the philosophers as writers of English as well as of philosophy, and, while he counts it his business to describe their philosophy, he sends his volume to be included in this series because they wrote their philosophy in a good English style. This double interest has affected the book very pleasantly. It has reminded Professor Seth that he is a philosopher himself, and that he must write good English.

Messrs. Duckworth have published a new edition of *Science and Religion in Contemporary Philosophy*, by Professor Boutroux. They have included it in their handsome 'Crown Library' (5s. net). It is a book of merit enough to give that Library distinction; and that is necessary, for there are now at least three different series of books issued from different publishing houses which go by the name of the Crown Library.

Messrs. Duckworth are also about to publish in their 'Crown Library' Leslie Stephen's *The English Utilitarians*. The first volume is ready (5s. net).

In spite of the crowd of books which have been written recently on the Social Question, in spite of the crowd that have been written on the Ethics of our Lord, there is room for Professor Henry C. Vedder's book on *Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net), and that for the simple reason that there is always room at the top. There is an atmosphere of quietness and confidence throughout. Professor Vedder is no novice in the study of Christ's ethics, no novice in the knowledge of contemporary socialism. He brings the one to bear upon the other with the effect of clearing up both marvellously. He knows that he can do nothing to improve the teaching of Jesus on social life, but he can do something to bring out its emphasis. For the social suggestions of our day he can do much, and he does much, clearing away crudities of thought, revealing selfishnesses of intent, and showing how it is possible to bring everything into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

There is no war on our hands at present. Now, therefore, is the time to preach against war. When the war fever is raging it is useless and even damaging. The Vicar of Cobham in Surrey, the Rev. William Leighton Grane, has been preaching against war to his parishioners, and, more than that, he has written an essay against war, an essay that runs to 260 large octavo pages, and is in perfect temper throughout. He calls it *The Passing of War* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net).

One thing which has been seen and is earnestly advocated by Mr. Grane is this. The day is past when the argument for war could be used that nations would always go in for war when they found it to their own advantage to do so. Men do not always act so; and nations are men. The time has come in which a great principle, at work from the beginning of the Christian era, is recognized as in active operation. It is the principle that sacrifice of our own interests is to be made to the good of the community. 'The "ideal citizen," who profits nothing by the reform he sets himself to carry out, not only exists but is becoming an increasing force in the State.' With these words, quoted from a speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Grane is heartily in agreement. And as the 'ideal citizen' increases and makes his presence felt, war and all other things that are evils, but supposed to be necessary evils, will come to an end.

Messrs. Putnam have published another volume by Dr. Horatio W. Dresser. Its title is *Human Efficiency* (5s. net). Dr. Dresser is a man with a mission. Having a mission he concentrates. Though this title is so wide, you may depend upon it that the author of the book will not carry you over all the earth in search of feeble examples to support superficial ideas. He tells you that efficiency is yours simply if you make use of your talents. The world is your tool; you are yourself the artist of your life. There is no secret to learn, except the secret of self-control. Take yourself in hand, keep yourself well in hand, use your faculties sincerely, and efficiency will come.

Does Dr. Dresser mean success, then? Yes, he means worldly success. By efficiency he means the power to bring the world to your feet. He does not rise higher than that, not because he sees no further, but because he has dealt with the things of the Spirit in another book.

Thus the book recalls the works of the late Samuel Smiles—'Duty,' 'Character,' and the rest. But Dr. Dresser sees things in heaven and earth that never entered into that popular writer's philosophy.

Mr. David Balsillie has written a book on Bergson, and has given Bergson as severe a handling as he has yet received. Not that Mr. Balsillie means to handle him mercilessly. He enters on what he calls *An Examination of Professor Bergson's Philosophy* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net) without the slightest intention of showing it up. For a time you think he is all on Bergson's side, and he evidently thinks so himself. But he finds that the philosophy will not hang together. The criticism becomes something like an exposure.

And as Mr. Balsillie has a free use of his pen, the impression left on us is that the most popular of our modern philosophers is not likely to keep his popularity long.

The curators of the Hibbert Trust have resumed the Hibbert lectureship. The first lectures of the second series have been delivered by Dr. L. R. Farnell. Their subject is *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion* (Williams & Norgate; 6s. net).

Dr. Farnell is the leading authority of the day on the religion of Greece, and he is a lecturer. The first part of that statement is proved by his great book on *The Cults of the Greek States*, the second by his recent book on *Greece and Babylon*. The latter book has come to most of us as a revelation comes, opening our eyes to a new world, and most pleasantly; it is the first volume of lectures under the Wilde foundation.

In the new book Dr. Farnell limits himself to Greece, and to intellectual Greece. We have had the *literature* of Greece so long before us that we read most refreshingly now any reliable account of the religion of the *people*; but this book does not forget the people altogether. At every step the author asks whether such and such a belief was confined to speculation or entered into practical life. There is, for example, the idea of 'pity.' In the 'Oedipus Coloneus' we read, 'Pity sits by the throne of Zeus, his peer in power over all the deeds of men.' As soon as Dr. Farnell has quoted the sentence he asks how far this spiritual idea was reflected in the actual worship. He can scarcely find it there.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Three Wise Monkeys.

The National Council of Evangelical Free Churches has issued a little volume of talks to boys and girls by various authors, with the title of *The Children's Corner*. One of the writers is the Rev. J. D. Jones, M.A., B.D., whose talk is on 'The Three Wise Monkeys.' 'The other day a friend showed me a most curious ornament which he had bought at Los Angeles, in California. It consisted of the figures of three monkeys set back to back, and one monkey had his hands over his mouth, and the second had his hands over his ears, and the third had his hands over his eyes. And my friend told me it was supposed to be a copy of a carved group in one of the Japanese temples, and was familiarly spoken of as "The Three Wise Monkeys," for the one monkey would not speak evil, and the second would not listen to evil, and the third would not look on evil. And as he explained the curious ornament to me, I could not help feeling that wise boys and girls would do well to imitate these three wise monkeys.

'1. First of all, the wise child will keep his *hand over his mouth*. He will never speak an evil thing. "Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth," prayed the Psalmist; "keep the door of my lips." He knew how easily and quickly rude and bitter words are spoken, and what mischief they cause. So he asked God to help him to keep his hand over his mouth! And if we are wise we shall do the same thing! Boys, beware of foul language! Never use words you would be ashamed of using before your father or mother! "Let no filthy communication proceed out of your mouths." Girls, beware of spiteful talk! Remember Jesus in whose mouth no guile was ever found! When tempted to angry, ugly speech, put your hand on your mouth, that you sin not with your tongue.

'2. Then, in the second place, the wise child will keep *his hands over his ears*. He will decline to listen to evil things. "Take heed," said Jesus, "what ye hear." If we sit and listen to evil talk, our hearts and minds will become unclean. So if ever you hear people indulging in unseemly talk close your ears against it. Of Colonel Hutchinson, the great Puritan, his wife said that "though he took pleasure in wit and mirth, yet that which was mixed with impurity he never could endure, and scurrilous discourses amongst men he abhorred." There is a story told of Bishop Hannington—that brave man who laid down his life for Christ in Uganda—that when he was a schoolboy he rowed in the school boat. Now, some of the boys in the boat were in the habit of using foul language. It was more than young Hannington could stand. He bravely told his companions he would leave the boat sooner than listen to their profane and filthy speech. And we, if we are wise, shall refuse to listen to evil things. That is the mark of the true gentleman and the real lady—"to speak no slander, *no, nor listen to it*!"

'3. And, thirdly, the wise child will keep *his hand over his eyes*. He will refuse to look at evil things. There are some things in the world we had better never see. Our safety consists in not looking at

them. "Look not," says the Scripture, "at the wine when it is red." When Christian and Faithful passed through Vanity Fair the traffickers in the Fair spread all sorts of tempting wares before their eyes. But Christian and Faithful refused even to look at them. They looked upwards, "signifying that their trade and traffic was in heaven," and cried, "Turn away mine eyes from beholding Vanity." And so exactly we shall refuse even to look at foul and base things.

'John Bunyan, in his *Holy War*, says that the city of Man-Soul (which really means your heart and mine) has five gates which he calls Ear-gate, Eye-gate, Mouth-gate, Nose-gate, and Feet-gate. But of these five gates Ear-gate, Eye-gate, and Mouth-gate are far the most important. And if we keep these gates secure, if we speak no evil, listen to no evil, look upon no evil, we shall keep our hearts unharmed, we shall keep Man-Soul for Jesus Christ.'

The Calendar, the Sabbath, and the Marriage Law in the Geniza-Zadokite Document.

By the Rev. G. Margoliouth, M.A., British Museum, London.

The present article is intended to be strictly non-controversial, both in essence and in form. Readers interested in the discussions that have arisen about the tendency and date of the documents published by Dr. Schechter towards the end of 1910 through the Cambridge University Press may, for example, turn to *The Athenæum* for November 26, 1910, *The Jewish Chronicle* for December 9, 1910, *Revue des Études Juives* for April 1911, *The American Journal of Theology* for July 1911, *Bibliotheca Sacra* for the same month, and *The Expositor* for December 1911 and March 1912. But the sole object of the present contribution is to show as clearly as possible what the documents in question teach on the topics indicated in the heading. It is indeed likely that the results thus obtained may constitute a very substantial aid in any future attempt at finally demonstrating the affinities of the writing under consideration and the age (whether, *e.g.*, second century B.C.,[1] or first century B.C.,[2] or between 70 and 80 A.D.[3]) in which it was composed. But for the moment only facts relating to the topics named will be set down and discussed, and no attempt will be made to draw any inferences as to what may be termed the 'higher critical' bearing of the problem; or if any mention should perforce have to be made to one particular view or another, it will be done without the least prejudice, and merely in the form of an unavoidable reference.

[1] Professor G. F. Moore. [2] Professor K. Kohler.
[3] Professor Bacher and others.

I. The Calendar.

On reading the documents[4] cursorily for the first time, one may receive the impression that there is nothing in them to show what kind of Calendar the body of people from whom they emanated followed. But there can hardly be a doubt that on this point the position taken in the Introduction[5] to Dr. Schechter's edition is fully justified. The learned editor, or one of his collaborators, was struck with the close similarity that exists between the following two passages, the first being taken from p. 3, ll. 12–16, of document A, and the second representing the Book of Jubilees, 6^{34}.

'But with them who held fast the commandments of God, that were left among them, God confirmed His covenant with Israel for ever, for the purpose of making known to them the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray: His

[4] The documents as recovered by Dr. Schechter from the Cairo Genizah consist of (i.) a historical and admonitory part, and (ii.) a special legalistic part. The former occupies pp. 1–8, and is completed (with partial overlapping) by pp. 19–20, which represent a different recension of the text. The latter (legalistic) part, which occupies pp. 9–16 of the edition, is very fragmentary. The document consisting of pp. 1–16 (A) was probably copied in the tenth century, and pp. 19–20 (B) belong to the eleventh or twelfth century.

[5] pp. xvi, xix–xx.

holy Sabbath, His glorious festivals, the testimony of His righteousness, and the ways of His truth, and the desires of His will, which a man should do and live by them.'

'And all the children of Israel will forget, and will not find the path of the years, and will forget the new moons and seasons, and Sabbaths, and they will go wrong as to all the order of the years.'[1]

Now it is true that if this parallelism had been unsupported by sufficiently strong confirmatory evidence, the opinion could have possibly been advanced that the likeness between the two passages need not be much more than accidental, or that it was in any case of no sufficient strength to bear the weight of Dr. Schechter's definite statement that the calendar of the sectaries (as one may, without prejudicing the case, conveniently call the people from whom the writing emanated) was the same as that of the Book of Jubilees. But there is fortunately a considerable amount of other clear evidence regarding the close relationship of our documents with the Book of Jubilees and their dependence on it.

On p. 16, ll. 3–4, of our text occurs the following sentence:

'And the exact determination of their ends,[2] to the blindness[3] of Israel regarding all these, behold, it is clearly explained in the Book of the Division of the Times by their jubilees and their weeks [of years].'

That we have here before us the shortest Hebrew title of the Book of Jubilees, in either its exact original or somewhat modified form, no one can doubt, its likeness to the extended title given in the Prologue of the Book ('the history of the division of the days of the law and of the testimony, . . . of their (year) weeks, of their jubilees throughout all the years of the world') being unmistakable; but the full strength of the argument to be derived from the passage just quoted lies in the fact that the Book of Jubilees is there referred to as an authority well-nigh (or, perhaps, absolutely) co-ordinate with the *Torah* itself. In the passage immediately preceding, the people are admonished to return to the Law of Moses, everything being 'exactly explained' in it, and the identical phrase (מדוקדק, exactly explained) is then applied to the Book of Jubilees, wherein is recorded the 'determination of their ends,' with regard to which the rest of Israel had been struck with blindness. But if Jubilees, 'the Little Genesis' (ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις), as it also was called, is treated in the newly discovered documents as possessing the same (or at any rate, almost the same) divine authority as the canonical Book of Genesis, it necessarily follows that there would in the minds of our sectaries be a strong tendency to follow its teaching; and as the strictly heptadic calendar lies at the very base of the entire work, it is clearly impossible to deny that the calendar of the authors of the documents must have been the same as that of Jubilees, and that therefore the likeness between the two parallel passages quoted above is significant and substantial, instead of not being much more than accidental.

The close correspondence in many particulars between the Sabbath law of our sectaries and that of the Book of Jubilees will be dealt with in Part II. of the present article,[4] but it is necessary to point out in this place that, judging by the very numerous unmistakable references in our documents to this pseudepigraphon, it must have either constantly lain before our sectarian authors or—what would render the evidence more decisive still—been assimilated by them to the extent of a full knowledge by heart. Dr. Schechter's list of Biblical and other references to be found in the document may in some parts want revision,[5] but it is certainly remarkable that no fewer than thirty-

[1] Dr. Charles' translation of *Jubilees*, vi. 34; close parallels to it are Jubilees 1^{14} 23^{19}.

[2] This translation of קציהם [*i.e.* the coming crisis of history] is here provisionally adopted from *The Harvard Theological Review* for July 1911, p. 348 (Professor G. F. Moore); compare the present writer's rendering of the same word in p. 2, l. 10 (*Expositor*, March 1912, p. 216).

[3] This seems to be the correct meaning of לעורן, which Dr. Schechter emends into לזכרון ('for a remembrance'). The idea is on a par with that of the 'going astray' of all Israel in the verse quoted above from p. 3, l. 14, of the document.

[4] For some other points of analogy the reader may be referred to p. 359 of Professor G. F. Moore's article in *The Harvard Theological Review* for July 1911. Professor Moore only finds a strong probability in favour of the identity of calendars, but it is here contended that we have certainty on this point instead of probability.—The Marriage Law appears to have lain outside the purview of *Leptogenesis*.

[5] A striking parallel of which Dr. Schechter should have made more than he did is that between Jubilees 6^{18}, where we are told that after Noah's death his sons fell away 'until the days of Abraham, and they ate blood,' and document A, p. 3, ll. 1–2, where also the sons of Noah are said to have gone astray, the obedience to the divine ordinances being again in abeyance till the appearance of Abraham.

four passages of Jubilees have been brought by him into relation with the new text, whereas the references to Isaiah, which come nearer in point of numbers to those of Jubilees, only amount to twenty-nine. This shows that Jubilees loomed even more largely in the eyes of our sectaries than any other of the Books that were held sacred by them (to the canonical Genesis only twelve references are given by Dr. Schechter), thus strengthening our contention that on such a topic as the calendar there must have been agreement between the two works.

One may therefore, without much fear of contradiction, assume as certain that the calendar of our sectaries was the same as that of the Book of Jubilees, and we must accordingly now apply ourselves to the inquiry as to the exact nature of the calendar that lies before us in that famous pseudepigraphon.

The answer to this inquiry rests partly on direct statements contained in the text of Jubilees, and partly on inferences to be drawn from direct statements. Part of the result is therefore clear and indisputable, whilst another part is open to discussion and a difference of opinion.

There is first of all the clear declaration in chap. 6, that 'all the days of the commandment will be two-and-fifty weeks of days, and (these will make) the entire year complete' (v.[30]), and it is furthermore announced that this order of the year, which was immutably fixed and written down on 'the heavenly tables,' was divided into four equal divisions, each having thirteen weeks, constituting three complete months, and the first day (new moon) of each quarter of the year being set aside as a time of special remembrance connected with the progress and cessation of the Flood (vv. [28-29]). As there is, besides, the statement in 5^{27} that the Flood 'prevailed on the face of the earth five months—one hundred and fifty days'[1]—it is quite clear that we have here to deal with a solar year of twelve months, each month having thirty days, with (by inference, 12×30 only making 360 as against the 364 days definitely given in 6^{32}; comp. Ethiopic Enoch 75^{2} 82^{11}) four additional intercalary days distributed among the four divisions of the year.

[1] The number of 150 days (see also Gn 7^{24} 8^{3}) is, however, not quite exact, as there must be at least one intercalary day in the course of five months, so that no fewer than 151 days must be postulated.

But having thus based our view of the calendar of Jubilees on the clear wording of a part of the text, we are confronted with the difficulty of reconciling this view with other indications contained in the same text. By a comparison of the statements regarding the Feast of Weeks, also called the Feast of First-fruits, contained in $6^{17ff.}$ 15^{1} and $44^{4.5}$, it becomes clear that according to Jubilees that festival was celebrated on the 15th day of the third month (Sīwān). But as according to Lv $23^{15.16}$, the Feast of Weeks was to be celebrated on the fiftieth day after the presentation of the wave-offering on the Passover festival, it follows that, contrary to the usual Rabbinic date assigned to that offering (Nīsān the 16th), the author of Jubilees considered the 22nd of Nīsān[2] to have been the day set aside for the 'sheaf of the wave-offering'; for only so can one obtain the period of seven weeks that was to pass between it and the Feast of Weeks. The reckoning must, therefore, have been as follows: The last two weeks of the seven covered the first fourteen days of Sīwān, and of the remaining five weeks four must have fallen in the month of Iyyār and one in the latter part of Nīsān. But if so, it is clear that Iyyār could not possibly have had more than 28 days; nor could Nīsān have had more than that number of days, for not more than one week out of the seven could possibly be assigned to the part of Nīsān that followed the 22nd day of that month.

These indications therefore show the existence of a lunar reckoning, in which a month could have 28 days, and the problem thus arises how to reconcile this calendar scheme with the solar year of twelve months of 30 days each, with four intercalary days, which—as we have seen—is the scheme clearly set forth in the sixth chapter of the Book of Jubilees.

Now the only solution of the difficulty so far proposed, which seems adequately to meet the requirements of either side of the case, is that given by Epstein in *Revue des Études Juives*,

[2] If, as seems likely, our sectaries interpreted מממחרת השבת ('from the morrow *after the Sabbath*') as meaning the day after the Sabbath (the weekly day of rest) in the usual sense of the word, the date of the wave-offering could indeed only fall on the 22nd of Nīsān, for the only Sabbath falling within the Passover festival would in that case be the 21st day of the month, as the first day of the festival necessarily would fall on Monday (see further on, and comp. Charles, *Jubilees*, p. 106).

vol. xxii. pp. 10–13. In Jubilees, Epstein holds, two different kinds of calendar reckonings are used. There was the civil solar year of twelve months, with eight months of 30 days and four of 31 days each; and there was besides an ecclesiastical year of thirteen months, with 28 days in each month. The entire number of days in the year is in each case 364, and the difficulty about the date of the Feast of Weeks vanishes absolutely, for the festivals would naturally be fixed in accordance with the ecclesiastical, instead of the civil year. Unless, therefore, another working hypothesis at least as good as that of Epstein be proposed, we are bound to regard this solution—provisionally at any rate—as the correct one.[1]

One point more, and this part of our subject is finished. As according to Jubilees the heptadic arrangement of the calendar dates in an unbroken sequence from the Creation, it follows that the first day of each month of twenty-eight days or four weeks must always fall on the first day of the week (Sunday), the day from which Creation dates; and as furthermore the Feast of Weeks fell on the 15th of Sīwān, and Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles began on the 15th day of Nīsān and Iyyār respectively, it is clear that Sunday invariably ushered in the great festivals. The Day of Atonement, on the other hand, as falling on the 10th day of Tishsi, was always celebrated on Tuesday.

This, then, was the calendar of the Book of Jubilees, which, as we have seen, must also have been that of the documents which we are now considering. In both works stress is laid on the belief that the bulk of the nation had lamentably gone astray with regard to the correct dates of the divinely instituted festivals, and in both is the lively consciousness expressed that the upholders of their own special calendar principles were the true depositories of the immutable heavenly decrees concerning times and seasons.

[1] Professor Charles holds the same view, though perhaps with rather less determination (see his notes on pp. 54–55, 105–107 of his edition of *Jubilees*). He sees a difficulty in the fact that the four days of remembrance at the beginning of the four quarters of the year (chap. vi. 23–29) are determined by the reckoning of the solar year of twelve months, instead of the lunar year of thirteen months. But as those festivals are not in canonical Genesis and owe their institution to a special set of events, they may be allowed to stand on a footing of their own.

Studies in Pauline Vocabulary.

By the Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A., Keswick.

Of the Heavenly Places.

Readers of the Pauline Epistles have, doubtless, noticed that the Apostle not infrequently sums up the argument or the standpoint of a given Epistle in one outstanding term or phrase. Such is the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ of Romans, the πίστις Χριστοῦ of Galatians, the πλήρωμα of Colossians, the ὑγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία of 1 Timothy, and τὰ ἐπουράνια of Ephesians.

Without discussing the question of the authenticity of the last-named Epistle, whether (in other words) it is Pauline or sub-Pauline, it is sufficient for our present purpose to point out that the occurrence of the unusual expression, τὰ ἐπουράνια, supports rather than otherwise the traditional view. Not only does the phrase appear five times in the Epistle; but it is so remarkable in itself, and so characteristic of this particular writing, that it is hardly likely to have been employed by one who sought to disguise his identity under a general resemblance to St. Paul's style and thought. The word ἐπουράνιος does not occur in the LXX, except as an epithet of Θεός in two passages in 3 Mac. So far as Hellenistic Greek is concerned, it is a distinctively N.T. epithet; but it is also found in Homer and Plato, and therefore is evidently drawn from the classical Hellenic stock.[1] While ἐπουράνιος is found elsewhere (four times) in the Pauline Epistles, τὰ ἐπουράνια is found only in Ephesians; and it is the use of the phrase in Ephesians which concerns us now.

[1] Nägeli (*Der Wortschatz des apostels Paulus*) notes its occurrence in 2 Ti 4^{18}, but does not include it in his list of Ionic-poetic Pauline words, where it may fitly find a place. I have had no opportunity of referring to the evidence of papyri and inscriptions for the use of the word.

It is clear that *τὰ ἐπουράνια* is equivalent to 'the unseen world' or 'the unseen,' and might fitly be so translated. It is not to be regarded as a mere synonym of heaven, if by heaven we mean a future state of being. For St. Paul it eternally exists: it is a sphere outside of time, a spiritual universe; a vast realm of the noumenal behind the world of sense. By its use, 'St. Paul warns us,' says Dean Armitage Robinson, 'that he takes the supra-sensual view of life.'

The following are the salient points of the five passages referred to:—

(1) *ὁ Θεὸς . . . ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ* (1³).

(2) *καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* (1²⁰).

(3) *συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ* (2⁶).

(4) *ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ* (3¹⁰).

(5) *ἡ πάλη . . . πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις* (6¹²).

Taking the last two passages together as introducing us to the conceptions of Jewish angelology, we discover that in the Apostle's mind the unseen world was peopled by spirits both good and evil. While in the Epistle to the Colossians he speaks with impatience of the elaborate orders of the celestial hierarchy as conceived by Gnostic Judaizers, here and elsewhere the Apostle reveals no divergence from the current Jewish views of the spiritual world. When he regards the heavenly sphere as the habitation of hostile powers arrayed against the Christian warrior, we are immediately reminded of the speculations of the Jewish apocalypses. The supra-terrestrial region is the counterpart of a visible world, where good and evil are in perpetual conflict. 'The prince of the power of the air' (2²), with his legions that 'rule this dark world' (6¹²) (*κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου*), occupies the unseen world, and carries on his operations there—a defeated and inferior,[1] although malignant, being. The conclusion which the Apostle draws from this remarkable conception of the heavenly sphere as the scene of a spiritual warfare is the practical injunction: 'Put on the whole armour of God.' The warfare is spiritual, therefore the weapons must be spiritual.

On the other hand, there is a hierarchy of good spirits in the unseen; and it is evidently of these that the Apostle thinks when he utters his glowing words regarding the function of the Church. The community of Christians who are saved by faith in Christ exist to set forth 'to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places the variegated wisdom of God.' 'Ecclesia,' says Calvin, 'quasi speculum in quo contemplantur angeli mirificam Dei sapientiam quam prius nescierant.' Yet we cannot but believe that the apostolic vision also included, even in this connexion, the forces of the unseen which were opposed to the Divine will. The good and evil Potencies of the heavenly sphere are regarded as spectators of the Church, which is to enlighten their ignorance of the Divine purpose—a purpose which was formed before the creation, in that it centred in the eternal Christ.

It is clear from the tenor of these passages, especially when taken along with the phrase already quoted from 2², 'the prince of the power of the air,' that St. Paul's view of the heavenly places is not wholly liberated from the sense of space and locality, which colours Jewish angelology. Lightfoot[2] has pointed out that 'things in the heaven' are not quite equivalent to 'things unseen' in Pauline language. 'Heaven and earth together comprehend all space; and all things, whether material or immaterial, are conceived . . . as having their abode in space.'

But in considering the other three passages, we leave behind us Jewish ideas and pass into a Hellenic order of thought. The unseen world for St. Paul is focused in Christ. He no longer knows Christ 'after the flesh'; that is, Christ is no longer to be apprehended through the forms of sense-perception: He is a spiritual Person. Hence the conception of the exalted Christ lifts St. Paul into the noumenal world; to use his own phrase, Christ makes him to sit, together with all the saints, 'in the heavenly places' (2⁶). 'The heavenly places' are the home of the exalted, spiritual Christ (1²⁰). The saint who is 'in Christ' shares His life, and therefore has access to His home. He is therefore fitly described as blest 'with all spiritual blessing' (1³).

Such is the language of one who views all things

[1] Cf. Edwards (on 1 Co 5⁵), dealing with the Jewish conception of Satan. 'The correct view seems to be that Christ and His apostles combined the Zoroastrian doctrine of an antagonist of God with the early Hebrew doctrine of Satan's inferiority to God (cf. Is 45¹⁸).'

[2] See note on Col 1⁶.

sub specie aeternitatis and to whom 'the supersensible has the reality of the sensible.' If sometimes St. Paul's diction recalls Aristotle, it more frequently reminds us of Plato. That the Jewish world was subtly interpenetrated by the influences of Greek philosophy, we can no longer doubt. If we wish to realize how the mind of a Jew could absorb Greek philosophy and become for its age the mind of a new theologian, we have but to turn to Philo, with whose writings the Apostle was well acquainted, if the judgment of competent scholars may be accepted. Readers of Kingsley's *Hypatia* will remember with what cogency Raphael Aben-Ezra expounded the Platonic origin of St. Paul's doctrine of the archetypal Man. Dr. James Adam, in his *Religious Teachers of Greece*, points out the affinities of Plato's psychology and St. Paul's. Lightfoot and Professor Ramsay agree in the conviction that the influence of Stoicism is very marked upon the diction and the doctrine of the Apostle: and we cannot doubt that the teachings of the Academy were equally familiar to him. For both St. Paul and Plato 'the visible is an image of the invisible.' Dr. Garvie[1] is hardly convincing, when he objects that 'in this there is nothing peculiar to the two thinkers, it is the general attitude of religion.' It is surely not too much to say that but for the Platonic theory of ideas St. Paul's conception of the spiritual Christ would not have been framed in the terms which are familiar to us in his Epistles, especially those to the Colossians and Ephesians, while the Platonism of his thought undoubtedly inspired the prologue of the Fourth Gospel and the argument of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

At the same time, St. Paul by his identification of the historical Jesus with the spiritual Christ escaped the abstractness which attaches to Plato's presentation of the ideas and avoided the superfluous dualism of the sensible particular and its spiritual counterpart, to which Aristotle, not without reason, objected in his criticism of the Platonic theory. The Christ of the heavenly places is not a logical abstraction: He is one with the crucified Jesus. Thus St. Paul's mystical conception of the unseen is never divorced from reality. To be ἐν Χριστῷ is not a vague aspiration, but a practical experience. Christ does not, like the Platonic idea, transcend existence: He bridges in Himself the chasm between earth and heaven, the seen and the unseen.

Thus, while St. Paul's language in his case of the phrase τὰ ἐπουράνια suggests mysticism, his mystical conception of the unseen as the spiritual background of human life is always *practical*. It is never a mere nebulous idealism that stands out of relation to the common experiences of life, its changes, its sorrows, its daily frictions and disappointments, its rises and its falls. In the midst of all, St. Paul

> by the vision splendid
> Is on his way attended.

Thus the Divine wisdom would seem to have used Plato[2] as a preparer of His way and Platonic thought as a foregleam of 'a better hope'—the conception of the unseen as the Home of the Ideal Christ, the Spiritual Head of the Church. We owe not a little to such writers as the Cambridge Platonists for expounding from the standpoint occupied by St. Paul a similar view of religion as spiritualizing material things. Listen, for example, to John Smith in his famous sermon on *The Excellency and Nobleness of True Religion*. 'True religion never finds itself out of the infinite sphere of the Divinity, and wherever it finds beauty, harmony, goodness, love, ingenuousness, wisdom, holiness, justice, and the like, it is ready to say, Here, and there is God: wheresoever any such perfections shine out, a holy mind climbs up by these sunbeams, and raises itself to God.' Or we may turn for an even more striking conception of the powers of the soul to a passage in the works of the greatest Christian Platonist among English poets, William Wordsworth. It occurred to the writer's mind a few nights ago when he witnessed a scene not unlike that described in the quotation. In the foreground a group of dusky firs and evergreens: beneath the overhanging boughs the gleam of the lake of Bassenthwaite: in the background the mysterious dim outline of Skiddaw—'and the moon was full.'

> Within the soul a faculty abides
> That with interpositions, which would hide
> And darken, so can deal that they become
> Contingencies of pomp; and serve to exalt
> Her native brightness. As the ample moon,
> In the deep stillness of a summer even
> Rising behind a thick and lofty grove,
> Burns, like an unconsuming fire of light,
> In the green trees: and, kindling on all sides
> Their leafy umbrage, turns the dusky veil

[1] See the recently published *Studies of Paul and his Gospel*, p. 11.

[2] Cf. Justin, *Apol.* ii. 13.

> Into a substance glorious as her own,
> Yea, with her own incorporated, by power
> Capacious and serene—like power abides
> In man's celestial spirit: Virtue thus
> Sets forth and magnifies herself; thus feeds
> A calm, a beautiful, and silent fire,
> From the encumbrances of mortal life,
> From error, disappointment—nay, from guilt;
> And sometimes, so relenting Justice wills,
> From palpable oppressions of despair.[1]

[1] *Excursion*, iv.

No image could more fitly express the transforming power exercised upon the experiences of life by the abiding sense of the unseen. Gleams of *τὰ ἐπουράνια* lit up for St. Paul the darkest disciplines of the soul, and he could face without despair 'the sufferings of this present time,' because he was able in the power of his Master ever to discern through time's many-coloured dome 'the white radiance of eternity.'

Literature.

ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

An English translation of the biography of *Saint Francis of Assisi*, by Johannes Jörgensen, has at last appeared (Longmans; 12s. 6d. net). It might have come earlier, for it was issued in Danish in 1906, and its devotional fervour and literary grace were at once recognized. Of course we have Paul Sabatier in English; but there is room enough for Sabatier and Jörgensen together.

The features of the book, we have said, are fervour of devotion and grace of style. Let it not be supposed, however, that these features carry with them uncritical credulity. Jörgensen has no horror of the miraculous, but he does not receive every miracle without question; he tries the miracles by the fair modern test of historical research. He is not, however, so much interested in possible cases of interference with natural law as he is in the development of the saint's character, in the events of his life, and the thoughts of his heart.

Not far from the beginning of the book there is this incident which occurred at the leper's hospital. It will give a fair notion of Jörgensen's manner of telling a story:

'On his walks in this place, Francis now and then passed by the hospital, but the mere sight of it had filled him with horror. He would not even give an alms to a leper unless some one else would take it for him. Especially when the wind blew from the hospital, and the weak, nauseating odour, peculiar to the leper, came across the road, he would hurry past with averted face and fingers in his nostrils.

'It was in this that he felt his greatest weakness, and in it he was to win his greatest victory.

'For one day, as he was as usual calling upon God, it happened that the answer came. And the answer was this: "Francis! Everything which you have loved and desired in the flesh it is your duty to despise and hate, if you wish to know my will. And when you have begun thus, all that which now seems to you sweet and lovely will become intolerable and bitter, but all which you used to avoid will turn itself to great sweetness and exceeding joy."

'These were the words which at last gave Francis a definite programme, which showed him the way he was to follow. He certainly pondered over these words in his lonely rides over the Umbrian plain and, just as he one day woke out of reverie, he found the horse making a sudden movement, and saw on the road before him, only a few steps distant, *a leper*, in his familiar uniform.

'Francis started, and even his horse shared in the movement, and his first impulse was to turn and flee as fast as he could. But there were the words he had heard within himself, so clearly before him—"what you used to abhor shall be to you joy and sweetness. . . ." And *what* had he hated more than the lepers? Here was the time to take the Lord at His word—to show his good will. . . .

'And with a mighty victory over himself, Francis sprang from his horse, approached the leper, from whose deformed countenance the awful odour of corruption issued forth, placed his alms in the outstretched wasted hand—bent down quickly and kissed the fingers of the sick man, covered with

the awful disease, whilst his system was nauseated with the action.

'When he again sat upon his horse, he hardly knew how he got there. He was overcome by excitement, his heart beat, he knew not whither he rode. But the Lord had kept His word. Sweetness, happiness, and joy streamed into his soul—flowed and kept flowing, although his soul seemed full and more full—like the clear stream which, filling an earthen vessel, keeps on pouring and flows over its rim with an ever clearer, purer stream.

'The next day Francis voluntarily wandered down the road he had hitherto always avoided—the road to San Salvatore delle Pareti. And when he reached the gate he knocked, and when it was opened he entered. From all the cells the sick came swarming out—came with their half-destroyed faces, blind inflamed eyes, with club-feet, with swollen, corrupted arms and fingerless hands. And all this dreadful crowd gathered around the young merchant, and the odour from their unclean swellings was so strong that Francis against his will for a moment had to hold his breath to save himself from sickness. But he soon recovered control of himself, he drew out the well-filled purse he had brought with him, and began to deal out his alms. And on every one of the dreadful hands that were reached out to take his gifts he imprinted a kiss, as he had done the day before.

'Thus it was that Francis won the greatest victory man can win—the victory over oneself. From now on he was master of himself, and not like the most of us—his own slave.'

THE BISHOPS OF SCOTLAND.

'In the year 1755 Bishop Robert Keith published in quarto his important work, "A Large New Catalogue of the Bishops of the several Sees within the Kingdom of Scotland down to the year 1688. Instructed by proper and authentic vouchers, etc." When we call to mind that none of the Chartularies or Registers of Religious Houses, or of Cathedrals, and none of the Public Records (with the exception of certain of the Acts of the Scottish Parliaments) were in print, it is quite wonderful to observe how diligent Keith had been in researches among the manuscript sources of information. In the year 1824, the Rev. Michael Russel, LL.D. (afterwards Bishop of Glasgow), published in octavo a new edition of Keith. In this he corrected some errors of Keith, and imported some new errors of his own.'

With these sentences the late Bishop John Dowden begins his preface to *The Bishops of Scotland* (Maclehose; 12s. 6d. net). The book has been edited by Dr. Maitland Thomson, who tells us that Bishop Dowden had no thought of superseding Keith. His purpose certainly included the correction of Keith's errors, and Russel's errors in addition; but his chief desire was to supplement the indispensable book of his industrious predecessor, and to that end he had access to a very great amount of valuable new literature. He had access to the Registers of the Cathedrals of Moray, Glasgow, and Brechin as published by the Bannatyne Club, of Aberdeen as published by the Spalding Club, and to a large number of Chartularies, for the issue of which we have to thank the Bannatyne Club, the Maitland Club, the Abbotsford Club, the Scottish History Society, and the New Spalding Club.

And, beyond all these Registers and Chartularies, 'the publication at Rome in 1864, in folio, of Augustine Theiner's *Vetera Monumenta* was an epoch-making event in the study of Scottish ecclesiastical history. This great work has since been supplemented by the series of precious volumes (begun in 1893 and still in course of publication) issued under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, entitled, *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland.* The volumes are edited by the late Mr. Bliss and by Mr. J. A. Twemlow, and commence with the year 1198. Many difficulties have been cleared, and in many respects precision secured by the records here made public. And yet the volumes come down only to 1447.'

These notes are enough to show what could be done by a diligent student to supplement Keith; and assuredly Dr. Dowden was diligent. Keith carried his Catalogue down to the Revolution, Dowden stops at the Reformation; for by that time the accumulation of new matter was enough to make a large volume, notwithstanding the freest use of abbreviations, and the tersest control of language.

The volume, we have said, is edited by Dr. Maitland Thomson. The editing is a triumph of loyalty to friendship and to truth. That is to say, love for Dr. Dowden set the task and sustained it,

but love for truth kept friendship from overlooking error. The editor's notes, whether corrective or supplementary, are distinguished by square brackets.

In a long and valuable appendix the history of the sees of Aberdeen and of Moray have been carried down to the present day. There is one name for Aberdeen now to be added, however. The record ends with Bishop Rowland Ellis, after whose name occur the words *multos annos*; and even as these words were passing under the press, Bishop Ellis had passed away.

EDWARD KING.

Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln, is the title which Mr. G. W. E. Russell has given to his biography of Bishop King (Smith, Elder & Co.; 7s. 6d. net). It is not a great biography. Three things, says Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, are necessary to make a biography great, nobility in the subject of it, plenty of material, and capacity in the biographer. We may admit the existence of the first and third necessities here, but the second is wanting. Dr. King was notoriously *not* a letter-writer—'never answered letters' is what is admitted of him here. And his life was too uneventful to furnish materials for a great biography without them.

For all that, his was a life that deserved to be put on record, and Mr. Russell has been loyal. There is no difficulty whatever in reading the book right to the end, and when it is read the impression left on one is that the time has been well spent; for it is always well spent time that is spent in a good man's company.

The qualities for which Bishop King's character was most conspicuous were shrewdness and sympathy. They are qualities that probably do not lie very far apart. 'His power of sympathy amounted to genius, and gave him an almost supernatural insight into human hearts.' It was probably this combination of sympathy and shrewdness that made him so strong an advocate of the Confessional. For otherwise he was not an extreme ritualist. After every Archiepiscopal judgment he counselled obedience, and practised it. When 'The English Hymnal' appeared he forbade its use in Lincoln on account of the hymns it contained implying Invocation of the Saints; and he did not practise prayer for the dead. He writes, 'I have just seen in the "Church Times" that your dear brother Willie has gone to his rest. Deo gratias! Dear, lovely, brave, saintly fellow! Thank God! I have prayed for him every day for years. I shall miss him in that way, but I can remember him still.'

Mr. Russell, we have said, is loyal. His loyalty to King leads him very near disloyalty to Creighton and to Temple. To the former especially he is somewhat unfair. That he was called (by Temple himself, as it happens) 'abominably clever' is true, but he did not make an entire mess of things in London, and it is not just to say, 'The stupidest bishop on the Bench could not have mismanaged the controversy of 1898–1900 more completely than it was mismanaged by the cleverest.'

A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek has been written by Rev. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A. (Cambridge University Press; 2s. 6d. net), for the use of students in the Theological Colleges. Mr. Nunn is content with an introduction to his great subject in the hope that theological students once set on the right lines will pursue it further in other and larger books, of which there are some in existence and others about to appear. His book is quite elementary, making one wonder that students could be in attendance at Theological Colleges without already knowing as much as this about the Greek of the New Testament. But no doubt Mr. Nunn is aware of what he is about. For a beginner's book it could not easily be surpassed.

The Cambridge University Press has issued a translation of Professor Marucchi's elementary treatise on *Christian Epigraphy* (7s. 6d. net). They have issued the translation in an extremely convenient volume to handle; and for that, as well as for the excellence of the translation itself, the clearness of the printing, and the accuracy of the plates, they will receive the hearty thanks of that rapidly increasing band of students who are giving themselves to the study of Early Christian Inscriptions. There are thirty plates, and as each plate contains on an average three inscriptions, it is evident that we have a very good representation of the discoveries that have been made, not only in Rome, to which the greater number of these inscriptions belong, but also in Asia Minor and elsewhere. The little book is sure to give a dis-

tinct impetus to the popularity of this fascinating study.

The eighth volume of *The Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge University Press; 9s. net) deals with the Age of Dryden.

To Dryden himself it does justice. It is a long time since Sir Walter Scott expressed his astonishment at the neglect of Dryden, and he at least did all that a man could do to restore him to his place. But Dryden is less popular now than ever. And again it seems to be out of pure ignorance and its offspring prejudice. Certainly Dryden is coarse even for a coarse age and society; but that is not the cause of his disparagement when coarser and infinitely more corrupting novels are read in thousands. The truth seems to be that we are too introspective, and too anxious to be considered mystical, to care either for Dryden or for Pope. The new volume of *The Cambridge History of English Literature* will at least give us the opportunity of recognizing our loss. The chapter on Dryden has been written by Dr. A. W. Ward.

Of the other chapters we are perhaps most struck by that on the Cambridge Platonists. Its author is Mr. Bass Mullinger. Clearly this is a story to which Mr. Mullinger has given many years and much affection. His style has that touch of warmth which makes writing literature.

A conspicuous feature of the volume is, as usual, its bibliography. How difficult it is to make up a complete bibliography of any subject under the sun. One of the attempts that come near completeness is the bibliography of Dryden in this volume, which has been prepared by Mr. Henry B. Wheatley, and is based on his own unique collections and researches in the subject. Mr. Bass Mullinger misses some things in the Cambridge Platonists—among the rest a fine article in *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, by the White's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford.

It is now generally recognized that there are in the New Testament two types of doctrine, the one Pauline and the other Johannine. Their distinctive words are 'righteousness' and 'life.' The one type came from a study of the Law, the other from acquaintance with Eschatology and Apocalyptic. At the present time the Johannine type of doctrine receives most attention. It is therefore with unusual expectation that we open a handsome volume on *Primitive Christian Eschatology* (Cambridge University Press; 10s. 6d. net) which has been written by a young and brilliant Cambridge scholar, the Rev. E. C. Dewick, M.A., now Tutor and Dean of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead. The volume contains the essay which gained the Hulsean Prize for 1908. Its author has used all his spare time since then in improving it; so that now we have a fresh, vigorous, and sufficiently mature discussion of the whole subject of early Christian eschatology, together with an introductory survey of the Eschatology of the Old Testament and of the Apocalyptic Literature of later (prechristian) Judaism.

The keenest edge of the Eschatological problem is that which cuts into the doctrine of the Person of Christ. The broad question is whether Christ taught a speedy and catastrophic end of all things, or a gradual and long-continued growth of the Kingdom. The answer affects our doctrine of His Person; just as our doctrine of His Person is very likely to affect our answer. So Mr. Dewick states plainly his doctrine of the Person of Christ:

'Of all these problems,' he says, 'the most vital is that which concerns the Person of Jesus Christ; and the attitude taken up with regard to this question will inevitably modify the whole method of studying a subject such as Christian eschatology. Any attempt at precise definition in this matter is liable to lapse either into shallow irreverence or meaningless obscurity; but perhaps the standpoint of the present essay with regard to this fundamental question will be sufficiently indicated by two quotations. The first is from the definition of Christ's Person in an ancient Confession of Catholic Christendom:

'"Perfect God, and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting:

'"Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead: and inferior to the Father, as touching his Manhood."'

The second quotation is from Dr. Moberly:

'In [our Lord's] human life on earth, as Incarnate, He is not sometimes, but consistently, always, in every act and every detail, Human. The Incarnate never leaves His Incarnation. . . . Whatever the reverence of their motive may be, men do harm to consistency and to truth by keeping open, as it were, a sort of non-human sphere, or aspect, of the Incarnation. . . . By looking for

the Divine side by side with the human, instead of discerning the Divine within the human, we miss the significance of them both.'

The 'International Critical Commentary' on *Isaiah*, much longed for, has appeared. At least the first volume has appeared. That volume is edited by Professor Buchanan Gray of Mansfield College, Oxford (12s.). It covers the first twenty-seven chapters, and contains a long and momentous Introduction. Dr. Buchanan Gray will write the Commentary on the next twelve chapters also. Then the Commentary on chapters 40 to 66 will be written by Professor Peake, and, with Dr. Buchanan Gray's second portion, will form the second volume.

We have called the Introduction momentous. For it will settle for a long time to come many disputed matters, so sane is it and so thoroughly have all the conditions been appreciated and all the literature studied.

But it is too great a book for a brief notice. It must be kept for a fuller review.

To Messrs. T. & T. Clark's series of 'Primers for Teachers and Senior Bible Class Students,' edited by the Rev. George Henderson, B.D., a volume has been contributed by Professor Edgar McFadyen, D.D., on *The Historical Narrative of the Old Testament* (6d. net). He divides the Old Testament narrative literature into six portions, beginning with 'The Fathers of the Hebrew Nation' and ending with 'The Restoration from Exile'; and of every portion he gives first a historical sketch, and then an estimate of its spirit and resources. For this delicate work Dr. McFadyen is fitted almost ideally. In this book, small as it is, he has shown himself a master of clear thinking and picturesque wording.

The English translation of Professor Albert Thumb's *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular* (T. & T. Clark; 12s. net) appears most opportunely. Are not delegates being sent from all our Universities to Athens this very summer to attend the University celebrations there? They must be able to speak Greek. And it is probable that the most fluent acquaintance with the tongue of Thucydides will not serve their purpose in an Athenian restaurant.

Now Professor Thumb is the greatest authority on the language of modern Greece. And he has the gift of lucid exposition. More than that, his enthusiasm for his subject is catching. Besides the delegates to Athens, there will be not a few found studying the grammar of modern Greek this summer for the mere love of it. Between the Greek grammars of our school days and this fine volume there has been thrown a bridge by the discovery that the language of the New Testament is the vernacular of the time of the Apostles. From the study of the New Testament it will be natural to pass to the study of the Greek tongue spoken to-day. And then, again, it will be found that a knowledge of the Greek tongue spoken to-day is indispensable to a thorough understanding of the Greek of the New Testament. Thus for many reasons the translation of Professor Thumb's volume is timely. And the translator, Dr. S. Angus, has done his part irreproachably.

When Professor Flint published his History of the History of Philosophy the flippant saw their opportunity. Give them another opportunity. Mr. William Prideaux Courtney has published the third volume of his *Register of National Bibliography* (Constable; 15s. net)—that is to say, his Book of Books about Books. But tell them also it is the best time-saving book that this century has seen. Since the first two volumes came out the blessings of innumerable workers have fervently fallen on Mr. Courtney's head.

This volume will have a wider circulation than the first two volumes; for, as the author says in his preface, 'the science of bibliography has made great strides in public opinion' since the first two volumes were issued seven years ago. There are about ten thousand new entries in this volume; and as each entry describes some book which gives a list of other books on the subject, the actual number of volumes covered by it probably runs into millions.

It is strange that at every turn of the road of life we seem to need once more to be assured of our immortality. Has Christ not risen? Has He not risen as the first-fruits of the harvest? Yet here is Professor Adams Brown of New York with another book on the doctrine of Immortality. He calls it *The Christian Hope* (Duckworth; 2s. 6d. net). He feels that the book needs an apology. Its apology is the chaos into which recent eschatological dis-

cussions have cast our thinking on the future. We need a guide. He offers himself. And he is very sane, as well as thoroughly furnished.

We are best acquainted with the earlier years of the Apostle to the Gentiles. A study of *The Later Years of Saint Paul* is therefore very acceptable. It comes from a Scottish manse, and it is informed with both scholarship and unction. The author is the Rev. John Rutherfurd, B.D., of Renfrew (Paisley: Gardner; 3s. 6d. net). Mr. Rutherfurd, we say, is a scholar. He is intimate with the recent literature of his subject, and recognizes its influence so far, for example, as to speak, not of the Epistle to the Ephesians, but of the Epistle to the Laodiceans. But he is a pastor also. What he writes on St. Paul he would have the common people believe, in order that they may grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Messrs. Wells Gardner have published four small books of devotion, which deserve to be mentioned, and which it will do us good to read. They are *Knights of the Holy Eucharist*, by V. M'Ewen (2s. net); *The Heavenward Way*, by the Rev. Canon Sidney Phillips (1s. 6d. net); *Confirmation*, by Canon Newbolt (1s. 6d. net); and *Emmanuel*, or Brief Helps to Meditation on the Incarnate Life of Our Lord, by Canon Henry Arnott (1s.).

Under the title of *The Plain Man's Creed* (Wells Gardner; 2s. net), Canon E. C. Owen, the Headmaster of St. Peter's School, York, has given an account of the faith that is in him, as well as a reason for it. He writes for the plain man, and wisely concludes that what the plain man looks for is experience. He himself believed these things, and they have stood the test of a life built on them. In the end of the volume he offers a more detailed discussion of the science and morality of the Old Testament, and a criticism of Mr. J. M. Thompson's book on *Miracles in the New Testament*.

The parents of Raymond Frederic West, a student in Leland Stanford Junior University, who was drowned on the 18th of January 1906, have instituted in his memory a lectureship at his University, calling it the Raymond F. West Lectureship, and making the subject of it 'Immortality, Human Conduct, and Human Destiny.' The first lecturer is the Rev. Charles Edward Jefferson. He has published his lectures under the title of *Why we may believe in Life after Death* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). From first lecture to last, Mr. Jefferson makes an earnest appeal to those who, through fear of death, have all their lifetime been subject to bondage, to find in Christ the hope that is sure and steadfast. But the appeal is based, not on Scripture, but on the nature of things, which is the nature of God as seen in the face of Jesus Christ.

Mr. Lynn Harold Hough has written a book on *The Theology of a Preacher* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). He does not mean to say that the theology of a preacher should be different from the theology of any other man. He means to say that no man can be a preacher without being first of all a theologian; and that there are certain doctrines of theology which are especially necessary and useful for a preacher. In this book he states these doctrines. They are such as the Place of Christ, the Deed on Calvary, the Goal of Sainthood. And he is particular to state them out of his own experience of their value and use for a preacher.

Messrs. Longmans have issued a new edition of Dr. J. N. Figgis's Hulsean Lectures on *The Gospel and Human Needs* (6d. net).

Canon Robinson of Ripon has prepared an edition of the Psalms for private use. Its title is *A Devotional Psalter* (Longmans; 1s. net). In preparing the book he has had three objects in view: first, to relieve the readers of the Psalter from the necessity of uttering imprecatory psalms, by simply omitting the imprecations; second, to provide brief summaries of the contents of each of the psalms; and, third, to attract attention to the improvements in translation made by the Revised Version.

It is the especial and urgent duty of the modern preacher to interpret Christ to his own generation. This duty presses upon the Bishop of Salisbury with unusual insistence. He has issued a volume of those sermons in which he has been wont to tell the men and women of London not only who Christ is, but particularly how He touches every issue of their lives. He is an expositor, certainly.

All his work has careful exegesis of the Bible as its basis. But the exposition is made that the truth arising out of it may the more closely be brought home to life and conscience. The very first sermon strikes the note to which all the book is tuned; it is a sermon on 'Christ and the People.' To the volume the title is given of *Calls to Service* (Longmans; 5s. net).

It is easier now, but it is not very easy yet, to write the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America. This has been done successfully, however, by the Bishop of North Carolina, Dr. Joseph Blount Cheshire—*The Church in the Confederate States* (Longmans; 6s. net). Dr. Cheshire has even succeeded in covering different ground from Dr. Fulton, who wrote the volume on the same Church for Perry's 'History of the American Episcopal Church.' He has kept clear of Fulton by giving himself more to incident and personality than to constitution or law. His account of the dilemma in which the Church found herself after the Civil War is full and fair and extremely interesting. For that matter the whole book is interesting, for Dr. Cheshire has his pen well in hand and chooses his topics skilfully.

Order your copy of *The English Catalogue of Books* for 1911 (Sampson Low; 6s. net). It is 'bonnie reading,' as Mr. Andrew Lang says of the antiquarian booksellers' catalogues. And it is as good as it is good-looking. We detect more care as the years pass. And in truth the cataloguing of a year's books needs both care and consideration. Here we have the book under its author's name, and under its own name, the month and day of issue, the size and the price. The directory of publishers is up to date.

The Rev. James Smith of Bombay recently issued an easy introduction to the study of the Life of Christ. He has now published as easy an introduction to the Old Testament; that is to say, he simply tells the stories of the Old Testament over again in modern and easy English. The title is *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Macmillan; 6d. net).

Abide with Us is the title of a volume of prayers for home use which has been written by Miss Constance Coote (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d.). There is one for every morning and one for every evening throughout a month, and there are separate prayers for special occasions. The spirit is good; the language is natural.

Mr. Murray has issued a popular edition of Sir M. E. Grant Duff's *Notes from a Diary, 1851–1872* (1s. net). It is a marvel that Grant Duff's notes have not been ten times more popular than they have been, they are such a frank revelation of the literary and political life of his time. Perhaps this cheap edition will set the heather on fire.

The National Free Church Council (Memorial Hall, E.C.) has issued a volume of sermons by Dr. Wilbur Chapman, entitled *Bells of Gold* (2s. 6d. net). Now Dr. Chapman's sermons are not good reading. He loses in the printing press more than most men. But if the sentences do not always hang together, and if the thought is often ordinary, there remains a sense of intense earnestness and much effective illustration.

The National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches has a series of small volumes in hand, under the editorship of Mr. H. Elvet Lewis, M.A., and under the title of 'Leaders of Revival.' The series is to include 'George Fox' by Mr. H. G. Wood, 'Richard Baxter' by Mr. George Eayrs, 'The Moravians' by Bishop Hassé, 'The Welsh Revivalists' by the editor himself, 'Wesley and Whitefield' by Dr. H. M. Hughes, 'M'Cheyne' by Dr. Alexander Smellie, and 'American Revivalists' by Mr. F. B. Meyer. *Richard Baxter* by Mr. Eayrs is out (1s. net). And it is a relief to find that it is not a colourless skimming of the surface, as so many of the cheap epitomes of the present day are. It has matter in it; it has living human interest; it has even good telling anecdotes; and, above all, it has Baxter, with all his soul-saving earnestness.

Dr. James H. Brookes answers the question, *Did Jesus Rise?* (which he has made the title of a new book) by what he calls 'a fearless facing of the vital fact of Christianity' (Glasgow: Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net). He has no new arguments, but he states the old over again with some emphasis.

A new, courageous, scholarly, and utterly futile effort has been made by the Rev. Clayton R. Bowen, A.B., B.D., Professor of New Testament

Interpretation in the Meadville Theological School, to account for the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead while denying the fact. The belief was due to the extraordinary force of His personality. 'This is, after all, the great miracle, the impress of Jesus' personality on his disciples. It was so deep and strong, in a word, that they saw him after he had died. This is the real secret of the "appearances."' And if you are inclined to ask, 'Is that all?' Professor Bowen will answer, 'For a man by his gifts of soul, by *what he was*, to produce this great conviction of his immediate victory over death, how much grander and truer a thing is this than a conviction based on the crude material sensible evidences of a corpse revived, of wounded hands and feet that are touched and felt, of a body that eats and drinks and walks and talks.' He will even cast Scripture at you reproachfully, saying, 'Because thou hast seen, hast thou believed? Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. An evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it save the sign of Jonah the prophet.'

And yet the book is scholarly. Its title is *The Resurrection in the New Testament* (Putnam; 6s. net).

The Yale Lectures on Preaching for 1911 were delivered by the Rev. Frank W. Gunsaulus, D.D., LL.D., Minister of Central Church, Chicago. They have been published by Messrs. Revell, under the title of *The Minister and the Spiritual Life* (4s. 6d. net). So many courses of Yale Lectures have been delivered and published, that, to avoid overlapping, a lecturer must now choose some definite topic, even if it be limited, and endeavour to treat it exhaustively. Dr. Gunsaulus chose the spiritual life. Now by the spiritual life he did not mean the life of the regenerate. In its fulness it depends upon 'our apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ'; but in itself it is the gift of God to every man. He would divide life in the usual way into physical, social, and spiritual; and his purpose is to commend the cultivation of the spiritual life as the highest and most enduring form of life with which man is endowed. The Yale Lectures are, of course, addressed to students in training for the ministry. Dr. Gunsaulus seeks to equip them for their work, not by describing the best methods of doing it, but by showing them how to be themselves fit to do it.

This is only one of a considerable bundle of books which Messrs. Revell have published this spring season.

There is, besides, a small volume of practical ethics entitled *Essential Elements of Business Character* (2s. 6d. net), written by Mr. Herbert G. Stockwell. It is not an encouragement to seek success in business, but to seek a successful character. Mr. Stockwell is not afraid to say that good character is likely to make good business, but he knows very well that if a young man attempts to obtain character in order that he may be successful in business he is not likely to obtain it. Character is the end of desire or it is not in it.

Then there is a wise book on *The Modern Man and the Church*, by the Rev. John F. Dobbs, Pastor of the First Reformed Church, Syracuse (3s. 6d. net). And its wisest chapter is on the Bible, the most difficult of all things to speak a wise word on to 'the modern man.' The question is, What authority should at present be given to the Bible? Now Mr. Dobbs does not insist on the infallibility of the Bible either in matters of fact or even in cases of conscience. It is no authority to the unthinking. 'The science of the Bible will be found to be that of the age when that part of Scripture was written. History in the Bible without exception will be found to be the conviction on such matters as are presented in the common lives of the people of that time. Fact, fancy, imagination, imagery, poetry and its licences, superstition and prejudice, will all be found there. But there will also be something more. There will be the highest, purest, clearest conception of God that the mind of man has ever entertained, and that much in advance of the times when the book was written. There will be something that ministers to the inner sense, and feeds the soul with spiritual food. That shows the divine in the Bible.'

Then come two books, both daintily illustrated and both delightful, though they differ in topic and treatment as India differs from America and mice from men. One is the pathetic story of what a little Indian girl is expected to suffer (and sometimes revolts from) in this enlightened century. Its title is *The Revolt of Sundaramma* (3s. 6d. net). The other is the story, scarcely less touching or even tragical, of two little field-mice who dwelt in the old oak stump on the bank of Pleasant Run brook, just above where it flows into Nineveh

creek. The title is *Woodsy Neighbors of Tan and Teckle* (3s. 6d. net). The author is Charles Lee Bryson and the artist Charles Livingston Bull.

But the greatest and best in Messrs. Revell's bundle is a new Life of Christ. A new Life of Christ must be great or be nothing. The author must have a great ideal and he must have great ability. There is no book one opens with so much fear and trembling. The author of this Life of Christ is Mr. G. M. Peters. He calls his book simply *The Master* (6s. net). It is a good title, for it is the lordship of Christ, a lordship gained by sympathy and sacrifice, that most of all appeals to him. The story is retold, from the Manger to the Ascension Cloud, in simple unsensational language, but with manifest emotion. No matters of doubtful disputation interfere with its restfulness. For Mr. Peters made up his mind on these matters before beginning to write and then he set down his convictions quietly.

Mr. Robert Scott has issued the 3rd edition, revised and enlarged, of *Fishers of Men* (2s. net), by the Rev. J. E. Watts-Ditchfield, M.A. The purpose of the book is to show the clergy how to reach the men of their parishes. In this edition the author has altered some of his methods in order to adapt them to the rapidly altering conditions of parish and labouring life.

Canon Robert Charles Joynt, M.A., not only prays according to the Prayer-Book, but also preaches. He finds his text in the Lessons, and more than that he finds the subject of his sermon in some doctrine or encouragement contained in the Book of Common Prayer. And now, when he has selected four-and-twenty of his Sermons for Mr. Robert Scott's series, 'Preachers of To-day,' he calls the volume *Liturgy and Life* (3s. 6d. net).

We have received a book which we have been looking and longing for, that is, the second volume of Dr. Alfred Plummer's history of *The Churches in Britain before A.D. 1000* (Robert Scott; 5s. net). For the first volume is one of the most delightful volumes of historical narrative we have ever read, so free is it in judgment, so reliable in fact, and so well written. The second volume has just come and we have not had time to touch it yet, but it is not likely to be inferior to the first. Dr. Plummer does not, like Macaulay, give his strength to the occasional great event, but maintains a steady conscientious excellence of writing throughout.

Is St. Paul's conversion the norm of all conversion? The modern answer is rather emphatically no. Is St. Paul's method of evangelism the example for all evangelists? The Rev. Roland Allen answers with an unhesitating yes.

Mr. Allen, who was at one time missionary in North China, has written a large book with this title, *Missionary Methods, St. Paul's or Ours?* (Robert Scott; 5s. net). In that book he expresses plainly and at length his utter distrust of the methods of modern missions and his dissatisfaction with their results. Among the rest, and perhaps most of all, he disapproves of all coddling. We must encourage the natives to walk alone; we must trust them with responsibility. This was St. Paul's way. And from first to last the advice that Mr. Allen gives is simply 'Back to Paul.'

Through Discipline to Victory is the title given by Dr. W. E. Chadwick to a volume of 'Instructions for Lent, Holy Week and Easter' (Robert Scott; 2s. 6d. net). The purpose, which gives unity to the addresses, is to discover where self-discipline is to be found. Dr. Chadwick recognizes its necessity as we all do. But is it self-discipline to wear unsavoury garments or do any form whatever of acknowledged penance? Is not this the true direction: 'Rend your hearts and not your garments'? So we have first an exposition of the Biblical idea of sacrifice, and its application to daily duty; then of certain qualities of the Christian life, as pureness, kindness; and after that we are brought to the example of the Master and pass with Him through Gethsemane to the opened tomb.

'The Apostles' Creed in its final form reflects and embodies two different aspects of the Christian faith. Christianity in its primary aspect is a historical religion resting on a basis of historical facts, and appealing to history, earlier and later, for their due corroboration and explanation. On the other hand, the Christian religion is a life of direct communion or friendship between God and man. This latter is what we mean by the mystical aspect of Christianity, and it is important to

realize that "Mysticism" is a vital and essential element in a spiritual religion. Christianity includes not only the intellectual apprehension of the revelation involved in the Incarnation of the Son of God, but also a direct experience of the power and presence of the indwelling Spirit of Christ. The possibility and normality of such an experience is implied in that expansion of the doctrine of the Spirit which seems to have begun in the fourth century. Two points in particular should be noticed: the idea of the Church as the special sphere of the Holy Spirit's operation was further defined by the addition of "the communion of saints," while the final issue and purpose of the historical Incarnation was summed up in the words "the life everlasting." Thus the spiritual experience of the Church gradually interpreted and supplemented the facts of the Gospel record. The things wrought and suffered by the Word made flesh were seen to bear their fruit in a supernatural life—a life of fellowship or union with God and with the children of God; and the consciousness of this union as a matter of living experience for the intellect, the affections, the will of the individual Christian, is what we mean by mysticism.'

That paragraph is taken from a new exposition of the Apostles' Creed which has been published by Canon Ottley of Oxford, under the title of *The Rule of Faith and Hope* (Robert Scott; 5s. net). We have quoted it because it is so fair an example of Dr. Ottley's style, and contains so clear a statement of his theological position. We are likely to have a good many books on the Creed before it is abolished. This is one that will still the enemy and the avenger.

A few weeks ago a deputation waited on the Archbishop of Canterbury to urge his approval of a scheme for a new translation of the New Testament. He did not approve. He thought the time for it had not come. But, as he spoke, a new translation of the Pauline Epistles, exactly on the lines advocated by the deputation, was ready. It is now issued by Messrs. Smith, Elder & Co., with the title, *The Epistles of St. Paul* (2s. 6d. net). What is it? It is 'the Authorized Version amended by the adoption of such of the alterations made in the Revised Version as are necessary for correcting material mistranslations or making clear the meaning of the inspired writer.' So we have a return from the R.V. 'All Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable,' to the old way, 'All Scripture is given by inspiration, and is profitable.' But in the same Epistle, 'He who was manifest in the flesh' is retained instead of 'God was manifest,' though 'manifest' is preferred to the R.V. 'manifested.' The text has been prepared by the Right Hon. Sir Edward Clarke.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has issued a fourth edition of the English translation of Mgr. L. Duchesne's *Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution.*

The author has carefully revised this new edition, and has added a considerable number of short notes, which have been printed at the end, and the pages containing them have been numbered 577A, 577B, and 577C. He has also added a note discussing the spelling of the name of the lady who wrote the *Peregrinatio.* He comes to the conclusion that the correct form of her name is neither Eucheria nor Egeria, but Aetheria. As for the date of the work, he holds that it belongs to the time of Theodosius. Some scholars refer it to Justinian's time. Dr. Duchesne is convinced that 'there is no agreement between the situation in the Seventh Century and that described by the traveller.'

Mr. E. Savell Hicks, M.A., has written a short account of the Higher Criticism of the Bible. He follows the most advanced of the critics, and he offers us their latest results. In the end of the book there is an appendix containing the narrative of Abimelech and his successors from the Book of Judges, cleverly printed in eight different kinds of type to show that the chapter has been compiled from eight different sources. The title of the book is *The Bible Literature in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (Sunday School Association; 2s. net).

Mr. Edward Grubb, M.A., has issued the seventh volume of his *Bible Notes.* This volume touches the subject of the Person of Christ in the New Testament. Touches it, for the subject is so vast that even these Notes, plentiful as they are, well packed, and of wide literary range, only touch the hem of it. The volume is prepared for the use of teachers; and, as in former volumes, a number of leaves are left blank at the end for their own notes and reflections. The publishers are The Woodbrooke Extension Committee, George Street, Croydon (1s. net in cloth; 6d. net in paper).

Contributions and Comments.

'Do this in Remembrance of Me.'

The New Testament gives us, in all, four accounts of the institution of the Sacrament of the Altar. Of these, St. Matthew's version is apparently derived directly from St. Mark's; at least they are practically one and the same. Comparison of the account of St. Paul with that of Matthew-Mark reveals a striking difference. At the blessing of the Loaf the former inserts the words: 'This do in remembrance of me.' And at the blessing of the Cup he adds: 'This do, as often as ye drink, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.'

The fourth account—that of St. Luke—presents great difficulty. There are (apparently) two cups, one before the loaf and one after. It is at the delivery of the former that the Lord pronounces the logion about the 'fruit of the vine' with which the Matthew-Mark statement ends. Moreover, St. Luke (like St. Paul) inserts: 'This do,' etc., after the loaf, while he omits the longer saying after the cup.

If the words, 'This do in remembrance of me,' are really part of St. Luke's Gospel, the explanation offered in this paper will fall to the ground—though the difficulty will remain. But Dr. Hort (*Appendix*, p. 64) sums up against them, saying that there is 'no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of Luke.'

Any one who takes the trouble to examine the question will probably come to the conclusions—(1) that there is a deep-seated error in the common text of St. Luke, (2) that his original statement is not now perfectly recoverable, (3) that it was so different from those of St. Mark and St. Paul that it received a number of attempted corrections, and (4) that no weight can be attached to any Markan or Pauline phrases occurring in St. Luke *as offering independent evidence*—except, perhaps, the 'fruit of the vine.'

We have, then, two distinct accounts of the Institution, the Pauline which twice inserts: 'This do,' etc., and the Markan which omits these words altogether.

The Church has always taken these Pauline insertions as words of our Lord. Justin Martyr in the first half of the second century quotes them, and frequently applies the phrase 'in remembrance' (εἰς ἀνάμνησιν) to the Eucharist. The bread of the Eucharist is 'in remembrance' of the Passion (*Trypho*, 41). The bread is 'in remembrance' of the Incarnation, and the cup 'in remembrance' of His blood (*ibid.* 70). Since Justin's day the obvious interpretation of St. Paul's words has held unbroken sway. None the less I believe that it is a complete misunderstanding of the Apostle's intention.

There are two serious difficulties, the one external, the other internal.

(1) The external difficulty arises from the comparison of St. Mark and St. Paul. Why did St. Mark omit, or St. Paul insert, the clauses? If St. Mark is dependent on St. Paul we cannot offer even a conjecture. If, on the other hand, St. Mark represents the Jerusalem tradition, then St. Paul has supplemented this by words heard in a vision (ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου). This is improbable.

(2) The internal difficulty occurs in St. Paul's conclusion (1 Co 11^{26}). 'For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.'

Does St. Paul mean us to accept these as the words of Jesus?

The phrase 'the Lord's death' is certainly St. Paul's.

The evidence of the liturgies on this point is instructive and conclusive. They all feel the impossibility of taking 'the Lord's death' as being spoken by Jesus, and they seek in various ways to evade the difficulty.

St. Chrysostom and the Roman omit the words.

Apostolical Constitutions, St. Mark, St. Basil, and the Ambrosian substitute 'my death.'

St. James has 'the death of the Son of Man.'

This shows plainly enough that $v.^{26}$ as it stands is St. Paul's; if we refer it to the Lord we must first emend it.

But if $v.^{26}$ is St. Paul's we cannot make a break at the end of $v.^{25}$. Only by violent treatment can we refer the words ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε in $v.^{25}$ to Jesus in the Upper Room at Jerusalem, and the same words in $v.^{26}$ to St. Paul admonishing the Corinthians. It is the obvious

connexion between the two verses that has forced the liturgies to insert an emended form of the latter. I turn the argument the other way. The latter statement is undoubtedly St. Paul's; then so is the former.

The whole of the Pauline insertions hang together. Both the first and second admonitions, 'This do in remembrance of me,' are the words of St. Paul to the Corinthians, and are not meant to be taken as a saying of the Lord.

What meaning, then, are we to assign to these famous words, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, if we regard them not as said by Jesus but as a 'rubrical direction' intended by St. Paul for the Corinthians?

Consider the situation described in the Epistle. The Apostle is the proximate source of a body of 'traditions' or 'ways' which he has handed on to all his Churches ($4^{16.17}$ $11^{1.2}$ 15^{3}). The Corinthians are praised because they 'remember' the Apostle and guard his traditions. But he stirs them up to further activity in this direction, twice bidding them be imitators of himself. He sends Timothy with this letter to remind (ἀναμνήσει) them of his ways. Now the celebration of the Dominical Supper is one of the traditions (παρέδωκα, 11^{23}, cf. *ut supra*) which has already been entrusted to the Corinthians. But the good custom has been corrupted. The Apostle therefore goes over the ground again, reciting the formulas with which the Lord consecrated the Host and the Chalice, and after each the Apostle adds emphatically, almost sternly, 'Do this at my reminder.' We may paraphrase his admonitions thus: You have been told all this before; I have myself celebrated the Eucharist among you; you have disgraced yourselves and done dishonour to the Supper; now that you are reminded, see that you carry out my tradition strictly for the future.

Can εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν mean 'on being thus reminded by me'? I believe it can. Of course the ordinary interpretation is far more obvious—otherwise the whole Church would not have fallen into the error. But notice that (supposing my interpretation to be correct) there would not have been any misunderstanding *in the minds of the Corinthians*, and it is from their point of view that the words must be judged. The whole passage is, on any showing, an appeal to previous oral instruction, and if the imperative τοῦτο ποιεῖτε had not formed part of *that*, the Church of Corinth must have understood it instinctively as the command of the Apostle to herself.

Now let us examine the words. That ἀνάμνησις may signify 'reminder' as well as 'recollection' will hardly be questioned. The statement in the glossaries, that ὑπόμνησις is the more accurate form in this sense is too 'learned' to carry much weight. The real difficulty lies in the εἰς which certainly seems to convey the sense of *ad quod* rather than *a quo*.

There are, however, at least two passages in the New Testament where the ordinary sense of εἰς will not do.

In Mt 12^{41} the Ninevites are said to have repented εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, *at* the preaching of Jonah.

In Ac 7^{53} the Israelites received the Law εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, *at* the command of angels (lit. 'commands,' but this is hardly English).

Both of these passages bear out the required sense of εἰς; in both the phrase seems to be equivalent to a genitive absolute, which is exactly my idea of St. Paul's meaning.

The passage will read as follows:—

'I received of the Lord that which I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night on which he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks he broke it, and said: *This is my body which is for you.* See that you do this, now that I have reminded you.

'Likewise after supper the cup, saying: *This cup is the new covenant in my blood.* See that you do this, as often as you drink, now that I have reminded you. For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup you proclaim the Lord's death till he come.'

Thus the great difficulty disappears. Whether St. Mark is dependent on St. Paul, or *vice versa*, there is now no vital difference in their accounts.

J. C. Todd.

Saint Ursula's, Ruislip, Middlesex.

A New Word for the Greek Testament.

In connexion with Dr. Nestle's interesting note on 'A New Word for the Greek Testament' in The Expository Times, xxiii. 332, it may be observed that εὐποιῶ is used as a single word in Modern

Greek; see the Modern Greek-French Dictionary by Vlachos, and the Modern Greek-German Dictionary by Petraris, where we also find εὐποιΐα. The Dictionary of Classical Greek by Benseler-Sengebusch gives εὐποιῶ and εὐπράσσω, with the cautious comment, 'richtiger getrennt εὖ ποιῶ, εὖ πράττω.' There is similar hesitation in Hatch-Redpath's *Concordance to the LXX*, where we find the entry, 'εὐποιεῖν *vid. sub* εὖ *et* ποιεῖν.' In view of the evidence adduced by Dr. Nestle, we need no longer hesitate in accepting for the Hellenistic period such forms as εὐποιῶ and εὐπράττω, especially as the classical writers themselves present εὐπραγῶ (Thuc.; cf. εὐράγησα 2 Ep. Clem. 17. 7), εὐπραγία (Pindar), and εὐπραξία (Thuc., Æschylus; cf. LXX 3 Mac 3. 5); εὐποιΐα is used by Arrian, Lucian, and Diogenes Laertius. The MSS. of Æschylus read εὔπραξις in *Agam.* 255, which has been emended by most editors following Lobeck; but F. G. Schneidewin retained the MSS. reading in his text, and in a note to his edition stoutly defended it as 'confirmed' (gesichert) by εὐρωή [εὐρωά, Pindar, *Pyth.* 4. 131, altered by the editors], εὐθεράπευσις, εὑροή, εὐποίησις, clenching his argument with an appeal to the name Εὔπραξις, found in Attic and Bœotian inscriptions.

T. HUDSON-WILLIAMS.

University College, Bangor.

Exodus xx. 7.

'THE literal meaning of this command is doubtful' (Hodge). But may not this doubtfulness be due partly to an inexact rendering of the text, and partly to want of attention to the idiomatic usage of a Hebrew phrase? Suppose we attempt to recast the sentence, in order, if we may, to get nearer to the original idea, and for 'take' read 'lift up,' as in Ps 24^4, 'who hath not lifted up his soul to vanity'; where נשא has the sense of 'exalt,' as in 1 Ch 29^{11}: 'Thou art exalted as head above all.'

Next, let it be observed, that in the O.T. Scriptures the Name is not the mere Word. It denotes the reality. The name of Jehovah imports God Himself. Cf. Dt 28^{58}, 'That thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, The Lord thy God.' The Name bespeaks Jehovah in His character. Mic 6^9, 'Wisdom beholds thy name.' It is God in the exercise of mercy. Ps 54^1, 'Save me, O God, by thy name.' Cf. also Zec 14^9, 'In that day shall Jehovah be one, and his name one.'

For '*in* vain' read '*to* a nullity' ('zu Nichtigem,' W. J. Schroeder). And the whole sentence will stand thus: 'Thou shalt not lift up, or exalt, the name of Jehovah thy God to a nothing—nullity.' Now does this mean, 'Thou shalt not apply the name of Jehovah thy God to a falsehood, as in perjury? That offence is first provided for in the Ninth Commandment; and therefore this one must have been understood to point to something else. What may that have been? What may have given occasion for the promulgation of this statute? A law is not of the nature of a programme. It is rather a remedy for an abuse. It is directed to some specific offence of a public character. 1 Ti 1^9, 'A law is not made for a just man, but for lawless persons.' Moreover, it is not directed against a personal fault, but against a public offence. In this case what may the offence have been? When, or where, might it have been committed? On what public occasions might people have been tempted to lift up the name of Jehovah to a nullity? Have we in the history of Israel any indication of occurrences of this nature? The occasions on which they would most probably appear would be in connexion with public worship. Now it is to be observed that the other three commandments in the first table of the Law are all concerned with public worship, and it may therefore be presumed that, like the rest, this one also refers to the same thing.

The occasion for the *First* Commandment was the prevalence of polytheism among Israel's neighbours. So also the *Second* Commandment had reference to the practice of idolatry. The *Fourth* Commandment secured for Israel more frequent opportunities for public worship than were afforded by the seasonal festivals. And this *Third* Commandment would seem to have for its object to guard against a careless, insincere, or hypocritical formalism in religious service.

Do we find anything in the regulations for public worship pointing in such a direction? First, in Dt $15^{19.20}$, we find a specific instruction upon this point; and in Ps 96^8 the instruction appears in a wider form. People were not to go to worship empty-handed. Examples of due observance were the visits of Elkanah to Shiloh, and of Samuel to Bethlehem. On the other hand,

it appears to have been necessary to issue the supplementary instruction in Dt $15^{21ff.}$. The prophets also found occasion to rebuke infringements of the original ordinance, *e.g.* Is 1^{13}, 'bring no more vain oblations'; and Mal $1^{8.13}$, 'Ye offer the blind for sacrifice,' etc.

Now, when we put all these things together, it is scarcely possible to resist the impression that this commandment was directed against hypocritical practices in public worship, and especially in connexion with the character of the offerings presented at the sanctuary. And, taken in this sense, is there not reason still for reminding worshippers in our churches that God is not to be mocked? Curious things find their way as offerings into the plate at the church door — coins that cannot be passed over the counter, and offerings strangely out of place in relation to those who make them; of which, as Malachi said, one would not dare to offer them personally to a civil authority.

A. Thom.

Tullibody.

The Healing of One Deaf and Dumb (Mark vii. 31–37).

No commentary in my possession points out what seems to be the fact with regard to this man, namely, that he had not been born deaf. When we hear of a man being 'deaf and dumb,' we generally assume that he was born deaf, and on that account is also dumb—not having learned to articulate. There are two reasons which lead us to suppose that this man was not of that class: (1) V.^{32} describes him as 'one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech (μογιλάλος).' This seems to imply that he did speak or make efforts to speak, but spoke with great difficulty or indistinctness. (2) Suppose a man, born deaf, and remaining dumb because deaf, should have his ears suddenly opened, so that he could hear distinctly. He has never heard words or sounds of any kind before. Consequently he would be in the position of one who finds himself surrounded with foreigners, of whose language he does not know a single syllable. He would have to *learn* to speak as an infant learns to speak, by practising sounds, by imitating the movements of other people's lips, etc. Of this man we are told that when our Lord healed him 'he spake plain.' This expression supports what I have said of μογιλάλος, as it seems to imply that he had spoken to some extent before, but now spoke plainly. Words and sounds were not wholly unknown to him, *i.e.* he had not always been deaf.

A further question has suggested itself to my mind. Was there anything the matter with his tongue? I believe that doctors say that mothers frequently are persuaded that their children are 'tongue-tied,' when there is nothing the matter at all. From one cause or another the child is slow to speak distinctly. With regard to this man, μογιλάλος refers only to the fact that for some reason the man could not speak distinctly. Our Lord's action in touching his tongue would not necessarily imply more than His intention to enable the man to speak distinctly. V.^{35} says 'the string of his tongue was loosed.' That may be only the expression of the popular diagnosis of his former difficulty of speech and its cure. Might the case have been as follows? A child with perfect hearing learns to speak quite distinctly. In early childhood, say under six years of age, he has some illness which leaves him stone deaf. In a short time he loses all his power of speech (though, I suppose, by the method of lip-reading it could now be preserved for him). Suppose he becomes deaf at a later age, when his habits of speech have become far more deeply rooted; he does not lose the power of speech then. But might there not be cases in which the man would become more and more indistinct in his utterance until he ceases to be intelligible, through his inability to hear his own voice and correct his utterance? Was this the true diagnosis of the case before us?

A. S. Weatherhead.

Huddersfield.

Genesis xli. 24.

But his bow abode in strength,
And the arms of his hands were made strong,
By the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob,
[From thence is the shepherd, the stone] of Israel,
Even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee,
And by the Almighty, who shall bless thee [R.V.].

The words enclosed in brackets are obviously corrupt. They are out of parallelism, and out of

rhythm; and they break a perfectly regular passage by the irruption of a wholly unintelligble phrase. All attempts to justify the Massoretic Text by explaining the 'stone of Israel' as an allusion to the stone set up at Bethel are far-fetched; and no satisfactory explanation has been given of the phrase *from thence*. The passage, however, is capable of a rectification so simple and satisfactory as to appear to me self-evidencing, and yet it seems to be very little known.

(1) In the LXX version there is no reference to the 'stone.' They render by ὁ κατισχύσας, which shows that they read not *'ĕben* but *'ōzēr*, a word which they have several times elsewhere rendered in the same way (1 Ch 5^{20} 15^{26}, 2 Ch 14^{10} 25^{8} 26^{7} 28^{23}). By adopting their reading we have *the Helper of Israel*, which is an excellent parallel to *the Mighty One of Jacob*.

(2) The clause מִשָּׁם רֹעֶה, 'from thence is the shepherd,' is the result of an obscurity which must have existed in very early copies, for the LXX retains the meaningless מִשָּׁם (ἐκειθεν), but omits רֹעֶה. It can therefore only be corrected conjecturally. Read מִזְּרֹעֵי, *'by the arms of.'* This, it will be observed, retains three letters of the M.T., including the two chief consonants of the word *shepherd*.

The line will then read מִזְּרֹעֵי עֹזֵר יִשְׂרָאֵל, and the translation of the couplet will be:

By the hands of the Mighty One of Jacob,
By the arms of the Helper of Israel.

This restores (*a*) the parallel, (*b*) the rhythm, (*c*) the natural sense,—and that with a very slight textual emendation. A further confirmation of it is found in the fact that it is in the characteristic style of the writer. It is part of the art with which this particular poem is constructed to repeat in expanded forms words already used; *e.g.* 'Joseph is a *fruitful bough*—a *fruitful bough* by a wall.' So here we have:

Nimble were the *arms* of his *hands*,
Through the *hands* of the Mighty One of Jacob,
Through the *arms* of the *Helper* of Israel,
Through thy father's *God*, who shall *help* thee,
And *God* [read וְאֵל] Almighty, who shall *bless* thee
With *blessings* of heaven above. . . .

The reading מִזְּרֹעַ was suggested by Professor Moore of Andover (see *Encycl. Biblica*, iii. 2977), but he retained אֶבֶן. Kittel mentions the reading עֹזֵר, but he retains משם as מִשָּׁם, *by the name of*, after Targ. Syr. The double emendation was adopted by Mr. C. J. Ball in Haupt's *S.B.O.T.*; but even so recent a writer as Professor Skinner fails to notice its felicity, and leaves the passage as obscure as it was before.

EDWARD P. RICE.

Bangalore, South India.

The Pounds and the Talents.

IN connexion with the note on the above in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for December 1911, Dr. van den Bergh van Eysinga's view may interest some readers who do not happen to have seen his *Indische Einflüsse auf Evangelische Erzählungen*, as he looks at the subject from a somewhat different angle. Taking for granted that, Mt 25^{14-30} and Lk 19^{12-27} are variants of one primal parable, he considers their likeness to an Indian one to be so great, that he ranks it (as No. 10) among his eleven specially striking instances of such correspondence to be found in the Gospels—namely, those in regard to which he thinks it scarcely possible to refuse to admit some sort of derivation from an Indian source. From this point, I quote from pp. 62 f. of the second German edition (1909). 'In the Uttarâdhyayana,[1] one of the sacred books of the Jaina religion, we read in the seventh chapter: "Three merchants set out on their travels, each with his capital; one of them gained there much, the second returned with his capital, and the third merchant came home after having lost his capital. This parable is taken from common life; learn (to apply it) to the Law. The capital is human life, the gain is heaven; through the loss of that capital man must be born as a denizen of hell or a brute animal. . . . He who brings back his capital is (to be compared to) one who is born again as a man. . . . But he who increases his capital is (to be compared to) one who practises eminent virtues; the virtuous, excellent man cheerfully attains the state of Gods."

'The Translator refers in a Note to Mt 25^{14-30} and Lk 19^{12-27}. But there is a Christian form of the parable, which corresponds much more closely

[1] v. 14 ff., translated by Jacobi in *Sacred Books of the East*, xlv. pp. 29 f.

with the Jaina one than the canonical form does. According to Eusebius,[1] the parable appeared in the Gospel of the Hebrews as follows: there were three servants, one, who squandered his master's property (*τὴν ὕπαρξιν*) with harlots and flute-players, a second, who multiplied the capital (*τὴν ἐργασίαν*), and a third, who hid it away; whereupon the first was approved, the second, merely rebuked, the third, shut up in prison. So far back as by Hilgenfeld, this was held to be the older form of the parable. Undoubtedly, the Gospel of the Hebrews presents the most simple and natural form of it; Matthew and Luke give variants of abstract character, which, in consequence of their being placed in the great eschatological discourses and explained as referring to the final judgment, distinguish only accepted and rejected, so that the threefold classification of the servants is preserved only in name.'

The book is well worth reading, but, elsewhere as here, fails to convince one that, the explanation of the—undeniable—correspondences it suggests, is the only possible, or even the most likely, solution of the problem. W. McCULLOCH.

Edinburgh.

'Mizpah' (Gen. xxxi. 49).

A SHORT time ago I visited a Christian Endeavour Society. After the benediction had been pronounced and a vesper sung, the members joined in the so-called 'Mizpah Benediction.' With no irreverent thought in my mind, I said to myself, Is the Lord a watch-dog or a barrier to be invoked to prevent these Endeavourers, or to testify that they would not attempt to injure each other after the meeting closed? Are Endeavourers of the same spirit as Laban and Jacob, men who were about a match for each other for craft and cunning, and who had striven to overreach each other shamefully! It strikes me as a singularly inappropriate form of benediction, and in no sense equal to the Apostolic Benediction. What are the facts?

Jacob left his home on account of his mean, shabby, unbrotherly treatment of Esau. He became a member of Laban's household: fell in love with Rachel: agreed to serve seven years to secure her to wife: was tricked by Laban in the interests of Leah: served another term of years for Rachel: no surprise can be felt that afterwards Laban and Jacob were not the best of friends: Jacob fled: Laban pursued: as the outcome of the whole affair the two crafty men agreed to separate on certain conditions: it was then that the 'Mizpah' event transpired.

A covenant was entered into between the two men. A third person was not present to act as a witness (not in the sense of to see, but to testify, as a witness in a court of law, or to append a signature to a document signed by two or more persons), a heap of stones formed into a pillar was to be the witness. This inanimate witness was termed by Laban 'Jegar-sahadutha,' and by Jacob 'Galeed.' The term 'Mizpah' was also given to this pillar, a term which means a beacon or watch-tower. This was to testify that the two men, then and there separating, would faithfully observe the covenant into which they had entered. It was also to serve as the point or place of separation by which they were to be kept for ever apart. From first to last it was not a *bond of union*, or a *symbol of love*; it was a *mark of division*. The moral principles of both men at that time were bad. Hence my surprise that the 'Mizpah' should be adopted by Endeavourers as a Benediction, tacked on to the unquestionable New Testament form, as if it were equal or superior thereto.

M. J. BIRKS.

Lower Bredbury, Stockport.

'The Titles of the Psalms.'

As far back as 1904 there was published by J. W. Thirtle, in a book under the title mentioned above, his discovery that what we had hitherto considered as *super*scription of the Psalm following was in reality the *sub*scription of the Psalm preceding. This discovery has been adopted for the first time by the *Companion Bible* (Part III.; Henry Frowde, just published). There it is said (p. 91): 'Few problems so difficult and baffling have been removed by a solution so simple and self-explanatory.' I must confess that when I first read Thirtle's book I did not at once grasp the consequences of his discovery; and now I do not wish to emphasize them, as any English reader may see them from the book itself, or from the *Companion Bible.*

[1] In the *Theophania*, see *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, ed. A. Mai, t. iv. p. 155, Rome, 1847.

But one question I should like to ask. In this *Companion Bible* it is said:

'When the Septuagint translators came to the word *lam'naẓẓēaḥ*, "To the chief Musician," they took it as being the *first* line of a Psalm, instead of the *last* line of the preceding Psalm which they had just translated. All subsequent Versions, in all languages, have followed them in this mistake. For mistake it was, as we may see from the only two examples of independent Psalms given us in the Scriptures: namely, Is 38^{9-20}, and Hab 3.'

'In *each* of these isolated Psalms we have the true models on which all other Psalms are based.

'In *each* case we have

'1. The *super*-scription, or title proper.

'2. The body of the Psalm itself.

'3. The *sub*-scription.

'In *each* of these two cases the word *lam'naẓẓēaḥ* forms the *sub*-scription, and appears at the end of the Psalm.'

Literally this has been printed in a Bible edition of Oxford, 1911. My question is: Where in the Psalm of Hezekiah is the *sub*-scription, and where in it is the word *lam'naẓẓēaḥ*? EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

Illustrations.

A volume is offered for the best illustration of any of the following texts in St. John's Gospel—$1^{3^{10}}$ $1^{3^{34}}$ $1^{4^{1}}$ $1^{4^{2}}$ $1^{4^{6}}$ $1^{4^{15-17}}$ $1^{4^{23}}$ $1^{4^{26}}$ $1^{4^{27}}$ $1^{5^{1}}$ $1^{5^{4}}$ $1^{6^{7}}$ $1^{6^{8-11}}$ $1^{6^{13}}$ $1^{6^{23}}$ $1^{7^{3}}$ $1^{7^{15}}$ $1^{7^{19}}$ $1^{8^{37.38}}$ $2^{0^{17}}$ $2^{0^{19.20}}$ $2^{0^{23}}$ $2^{0^{28}}$ $2^{0^{29}}$ $2^{1^{15-17}}$ $2^{1^{22}}$.

Also for the best illustration of any of the following texts—James 1^{17} 5^{16}, 1 Peter 1^{3} 1^{8} 1^{12} 2^{5} 2^{21} 2^{24} 3^{15} 3^{18-20} 5^{7}, 2 Peter 1^{5-7} 3^{13} 3^{18}, 1 John 1^{5} 1^{7} $1^{8.9}$ 2^{1} 3^{1} 3^{2} 3^{3} 4^{7} 4^{8} 4^{16} 4^{18} 4^{19} 5^{4} 5^{21}, Jude 1^{20-21}.

Those who are successful may choose two volumes from the 'Great Texts' or the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or one volume from the 'International Critical Commentary' or the 'International Theological Library.' Ten volumes will be given in all.

The illustrations must be received by the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, by the end of July 1912.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. H. J. Allen, Moresby Rectory, Whitehaven, and the Rev. J. S. Maver, Paisley.

Illustrations for the Great Text for June must be received by the 1st of May. The text is Is $53^{1.2}$.

The Great Text for July is Ro $1^{3.4}$—'Concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord.' A copy of MacCulloch's *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, or of Curtis's *A History of Creeds and Confessions*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for August is 2 Ch 25^{2}—'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart'; along with 2 Ch 31^{21}—'He did it with all his heart, and prospered.' A copy of Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for September is 1 Co 4^{5}—'Wherefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God.' A copy of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for October is 1 Co 15^{58}—'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts' or of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THREE articles in appreciation of W. T. STEAD are published in the May number of *The Contemporary Review*. One is written by Mrs. FAWCETT, one by Professor SCOTT HOLLAND, and one by Mr. E. T. COOK.

Professor SCOTT HOLLAND says: 'He was a most lovable man. He had something of the child about him, which drew and endeared. I recall the old days of Bulgarian atrocities, in which he and Liddon struck up their surprising friendship. I think of his confiding to Liddon, on a drive to Dunkeld, that he had learned more from John Knox than he had ever got out of St. Paul. "Indeed, dear friend; that, I confess, has not been my own experience," came the answer, in Liddon's softest tones.'

Mr. COOK, among other things, says: 'As I close these remarks, a letter reaches me, in which a friend of his recites a recent conversation. "When my work is done," he said, "I shall die a violent death." "How do you know?" "I cannot tell; but I have had a vision, and I know that it will be true, as surely as that I am talking to you." It is unlikely that we shall ever be told how he died; but those who knew him will be in no doubt. He must have faced his doom unflinchingly; for he knew no fear, and he did not believe that death meant separation. And, if occasion arose, he must have comforted and strengthened any weaker brother within his reach. It was what he was doing all his life.'

From Mrs. FAWCETT'S article we wish to quote several paragraphs. But let one paragraph precede them. It is from the *Life of Cardinal Manning* (vol. ii. p. 653): 'It is with diffidence and shrinking of heart that I venture, as I needs must, to touch upon an episode in Cardinal Manning's life which every man of right mind cannot but recall with infinite regret. Himself of stainless purity of life and thought, it never entered into his imagination to conceive the grossness of the methods pursued, under the pretext of purging the streets of London and its sin-spots from their moral foulness and impurities, by a pseudo-apostle of purity. Even good motives do not suffice to atone for methods so atrocious. Deluded, deceived by a sensational journalist's gross imaginings; accepting as true, horrid and harrowing tales of lust and cruelty which turned out in the main to be the product of a foul imagination running riot, Cardinal Manning gave his countenance and confidence to a man, whose name shall not defile even this unhappy page in the life of an austere and holy prelate. Even after the offender against the law of man as well as against the Divine Law was condemned to purge his rank offence in gaol, Cardinal Manning, in his strange infatuation, kept

up communication and correspondence with the evil-doer, still regarded him as a martyr to the cause of public purity.'

Now for Mrs. FAWCETT—and we shall not weaken her words by a syllable of comment: 'All who care for justice to women and who desire to see the law and its administration make sure that, as far as possible, the world shall be a place of happiness and safety for children, have lost a stalwart friend in the death of W. T. STEAD, who went down, on April 15th, with the *Titanic*.

'I first became aware of a new note in journalism—at any rate in London journalism—in the early 'eighties. Here was some one writing with a pen touched with fire about the things that really mattered—clean living, and the protection of children from the deepest of wrongs; and the pen did not give the impression of being guided by sentimentalism; it was evidently wielded by a man who had made a careful study of facts, and was prepared to give battle to defend the right. I do not think I ever heard his name till everybody heard it in 1885, when all London—and, indeed, all the world—rang with the shameless and cruel traffic for immoral purposes in little children, exposed for the first time in the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

'This traffic could have been, and ought to have been, stopped by law; but the Bill dealing adequately with these horrors, though it had been passed more than once through the House of Lords, had been, session after session, talked out, counted out, and blocked in the House of Commons. It was counted out no more after Mr. STEAD had carried out his plan of insisting that all the world should know that these devilish things were of common everyday occurrence in a so-called Christian country. When he undertook his chivalric campaign, the age of consent in Christian England was thirteen; little children of thirteen could therefore legally consent to their own ruin, and no legal redress could be obtained from those who were worse than murderers. Many other offences of the deepest villainy were unrecognized as such by the law, and therefore were liable to no legal punishment.

'All this was changed by the action which Mr. STEAD took. He was blamed for his sensationalism, for his want of good taste. But he knew what he was doing, and his training as a journalist told him that in order to rouse the torpid conscience of the House of Commons, shock tactics were necessary. I remember well his personal description of how he had been worked up to take the action which he did take. As a young man he had been greatly influenced by Mrs. Josephine Butler and her great crusade against the immoral Contagious Diseases Acts.

'It was Mrs. Josephine Butler who came to him with her heart-rending story, drawn from facts in her own experience, of the sale and purchase of young children in London for the purposes of immorality. Stead felt her message as a call for personal service. "Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the Heavenly vision," he might have said—the Heavenly vision of trying to get God's will done on earth as it is in Heaven. But though he was full of the spirit which leads to personal service, he was careful and cautious in regard to facts. He felt he must make the groundwork of positive knowledge firm beneath his feet. He went, therefore, with his story, Mrs. Butler's story, to Sir Howard Vincent, then Head of the Criminal Investigation Department. "Just tell me," he said, "are such things possible?" The reply was: "They are not only possible; they are of common occurrence." Stead broke in, "It ought to rouse hell!" and Sir Howard rejoined, "It does not even rouse the neighbours."

'Stead determined it should rouse the neighbours and the whole country, and through them the miserable indifference of the House of Commons to villainy which was contaminating the life-blood of the nation at its source. He made a plan for the fictitious, but apparently real, sale of a child,

safeguarding himself and her at every stage by the presence of trustworthy witnesses of his *bona fides*. He also took into his confidence beforehand the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Manning, and other high ecclesiastics. He then spread broadcast in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of which he was the Editor, the whole story. He accomplished what he set out to accomplish. The House of Commons boggled no more over the Criminal Law Amendment Bill; there were no more counts out and talks out of that long-delayed measure. The sons of Belial did what they could in the House to minimize its stringency, but they were no longer masters of the situation, and the Act which was finally passed was an enormous improvement on anything which up to that time had found a place in the Statute Book.

'The enemy furiously raged together, and going over the whole of STEAD'S story told by himself with the utmost circumstance and publicity, discovered a joint in his armour of precautions, and that he had actually, in his crusade, committed a technical breach of the law. A grateful country sentenced him to three months' imprisonment as an ordinary criminal. But he was almost immediately made a first-class misdemeanant, and went on editing the *Pall Mall Gazette* from his cell in Holloway.

'It is pleasant to read'—thus Mrs. FAWCETT ends her article—'it is pleasant to read what every one is saying of him now; that to him death was but the passage from one room to another of his Father's house; that it was quite certain that he would be among the last to leave the ship, that among the tragic uncertainties of this tragic event there was, at any rate, one positive certainty, and that was that he would never seek his own safety at the cost of others, but would die, as he had lived, heroically. No one pretends that he was faultless; but he had a great and generous heart, a boundless and intense vitality, and the spontaneous desire everywhere and always to protect and cherish the weak. We may be thankful for his life. "We are a nation yet," as long as we can breed such men as he was.'

A volume of *Studies in the Development of Judaism and Early Christianity* has been published by Mr. Edward Arnold, under the title of *The Parting of the Roads* (10s. 6d. net). The volume has been edited by Dr. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge; and the essays it contains have all been written by members of the same College. It is therefore a witness to the important place that the study of theology still retains in a Cambridge College. It is at the same time an agreeable testimony to the vitality of the teaching and influence of its Dean.

The Introduction has been written by the Dean of St. Paul's, and it is of the Introduction that we have something to say. But as these notes must serve for a review of the book, let us glance at the other essays first and at least give their titles and their authors' names.

Dr. FOAKES JACKSON himself tells the fascinating story of 'How the Old Testament came into Being.' The essay is not a mere restatement of the results of recent Old Testament criticism. There are elements in it that are new, and some that may be disputed. 'That Abraham was originally a native of Ur Chasdim (Ur of the Chaldees) may well be a historical fact; but at the same time the prominence given to the circumstances that he left the country never to return, and that this was the proof of his obedience to the Divine call, suggests that, when the prelude to the Law was compiled, the ancestral home of the patriarch was the centre of idolatry, which he forsook because the true God could not rightly be served there. The way in which Abraham enjoined his servant Eliezer never to permit his son to go back to Mesopotamia, lends additional plausibility to this theory. I am disposed, there-

fore, to believe that the compilation of the Book of Genesis is part of the great polemic against idolatry, which resulted in the promulgation of the Priestly Law.'

The Third essay (for Dr. INGE'S Introduction is reckoned as one) has been written by the Chaplain of the College, the Rev. Richard Thomas HOWARD, M.A. Its subject is 'The Devotional Value of the Old Testament.' This is another and better way of asking, What is the authority which after criticism the Old Testament carries? The conclusion which Mr. HOWARD comes to is that in the ordinary sense of the word the Old Testament carries no authority whatever. And if you ask him what is the use of it then, he answers that there are six most precious uses to which it may be put. We may learn the nature of God from it; we may by the reading of it appropriate to ourselves the religious experience of the saints; we may be brought by it into communion with God; it may serve as a practical guide to life and morals; it may be of use for the instruction of children and the ignorant; and it may even lead men to Christ—though rarely,—or at least—and this quite commonly—it may teach men to know Christ better.

The title of the fourth essay is 'Judaism in the Days of the Christ.' Its author is Dr. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, who starts at once by showing us that the Judaism into which our Lord was born was definitely marked by two tendencies, one Palestinian, the other Hellenistic. Palestinian Judaism was a religion of law; Hellenistic Judaism was a religion of hope. Both tendencies are apparent in the Gospels. Christ accepted the law as a whole, although He was occasionally critical towards it and sometimes directly antagonistic. The religion of hope, which found its outward expression in the Apocalyptic literature, was adopted by Christ as the basis of His teaching. At the present time it is to this religion of hope in the Gospels, or what is called their Eschatology, that attention is almost entirely directed. Its difficulties are very great. Dr. OESTERLEY does not think that we can remove them without further light. But he seems to be convinced that we are not bound to admit that Christ was mistaken in His thoughts about the future. It is better to say that our witnesses misunderstood and misrepresented Him.

Perhaps the most difficult of all the essays, and perhaps the most successful, is the fifth, written by Mr. H. G. WOOD, M.A. For Mr. WOOD'S title is 'Some Characteristics of the Synoptic Writers.' And the difficulty with such a subject is simply to say anything that has not been well said already. It is, however, necessary that we should hear the latest word even on a well-worked theme; and Mr. WOOD has the additional interest of a phraseology that clings. He speaks of the 'pessimistic Judaism' of St. Matthew, and the 'sanguine Universalism' of St. Luke.

The Rev. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, M.A., writes the sixth essay on 'St. Peter and the Twelve.' The title is not to be taken as if the discovery had been made that St. Peter was not one of the Twelve. Nor is Mr. CLARKE a Roman Catholic to separate St. Peter from the rest of the Apostles and compel them to do obeisance after the manner of Joseph and his brethren. When he says St. Peter and the Twelve he simply means that he is going to write the history of the Twelve, and especially the history of St. Peter.

Four essays remain. It is enough to name them. Mr. George Bertram REDMAN, B.A., writes on 'The Theology of St. Paul'; Mr. Bertram Tom Dean SMITH, M.A., on 'The Johannine Theology'; Mr. Ephraim LEVINE, B.A., on 'The Breach between Judaism and Christianity'; and Mr. Percival Gardner SMITH, B.A., on 'Revelation.'

A word on Mr. LEVINE'S essay. Mr. LEVINE is a Jew. The editor tells us that he is an orthodox Jew and seems drawn towards the ministry of the Synagogue. His contribution to *The Parting of the Roads*, says Dr. FOAKES

JACKSON, 'is valuable as giving us a Jewish view of the matter.'

Mr. LEVINE'S contribution is certainly brimful of interest. In dealing with the breach between Judaism and Christianity, a Jew of the present day is pretty sure to resent the picture of the Pharisees presented in the Gospels. But Mr. LEVINE is not unreasonably resentful. 'The Pharisees,' he says, 'whose purpose and aims have, I venture to think, been entirely misrepresented by many, were engaged in the further development of the faith of Israel. The Gospel statements and the evidence of the sources do not justify the condemnation of a body of God-fearing men for the misconceptions of individuals. Pharisee ought never to be used as synonymous with hypocrite.'

But Mr. LEVINE passes to much more doubtful ground than this. He declares emphatically that the death of Jesus was due to the Romans, and that the Jews had nothing to do with it. Perhaps it is not out of place to assure him that Englishmen have no desire now, however it may have been in the past, to lay the burden of this great guilt upon the Jews. They would rejoice unfeignedly if he could prove that the Jews never said, 'His blood be on us and on our children.' But it is not possible to accept his arguments as sufficient. There are many objections, he says, to any attribution of the death of Jesus to the Jews, but he names only three. First, there is the objection that crucifixion was not a Jewish but a Roman mode of execution; second, that a threefold execution at one time is doubtful; and third, that an execution on the Friday or on the day before Passover would be most unlikely. That is all, and in the face of the testimony of the Gospels, that is not enough to make out even a good case for investigation.

Now let us return to the introductory essay. It is written, as we have said, by the Rev. WILLIAM RALPH INGE, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's and Hon. Fellow of Jesus College. It has no title, for the same reason, we suppose, as John Wesley's parish had no name. Its subject is Christianity. But a volume of University essays must not be too discursive, nor must it say over again, however cleverly, what has been said before. It must mark progress, and it must make it. Dr. INGE recognizes the obligation.

Its subject is Christianity, and the first question is, Where did Christianity come from? The ordinary answer is that it came out of Judaism. Dr. INGE at once denies the sufficiency of that answer, and even seems to deny that there is anything in it. Christianity could not have come out of Judaism, for the simple reason 'that the cradle of our faith was not Judæa but Galilee, and that the Galileans had probably hardly a drop of Jewish blood in their veins.'

But there is another reason why Christianity could not have sprung from Judaism. Christianity is a religion, Judaism is not. What does he say? Judaism is not a religion? He says so. He knows how often it has been asserted that the Jews had a unique genius for religion, but he does not believe a word of it. There was one thing that they had a unique genius for: that thing was patriotism. 'Fanatical, indeed almost insane, patriotism was the dominant passion of the average Jew.' And so when the ancient Hebrews adopted Jehovah as their God, they fiercely declared that He was the only real God upon earth, simply because, as in the words of Philo, the Jew was the only real man. It was their patriotism, therefore, says the Dean of St. Paul's, that led the Jews into monotheism. For it was their patriotism that gave them any religion they ever had. With them patriotism and religion were in truth indistinguishable. And so whatever blessing they looked for in the future, it was always a blessing upon earth, not in heaven. There might be something of an ideal in it—the future must always be more or less idealistic—but whatever the future should bring forth to the Jews,

it must be recognized as among the good things of this present material world.

But surely the Jews had some consciousness of sin, and where there is consciousness of sin, how can there fail to be real religion? Dr. INGE does not believe that their consciousness of sin was of much account. 'As a learned Jew once told me, persons of his faith are never encouraged to "worry about their sins" (in Sir Oliver Lodge's phrase); with them the one and only requisite is to "turn to the Lord." In other words, conversion of the will is enough; bygones may be bygones.' And even their consciousness of sin, he says, was usually awakened by national calamity. When the political horizon was bright their conscience was at rest. When the political horizon looked very black indeed, it behoved every patriotic Jew to omit no precaution, no minutest detail of pious observance, if so be that the wrath of God might be turned away. And thus it came to pass that the religion of the Jews was not only confined to this world, but was also limited to legal observance.

Where, then, did Christianity come from? There is another possible source. It is the religion of the Greeks. Were the Greeks more religious than the Jews? Dean INGE seems to think that they were, and yet he does not deny the truth of the current conception of Greek religion. The contrast, he says, between the Hellenic and Hebraic views of life has been drawn out by many since Matthew Arnold. 'The difference is indeed striking between the narrow and fierce absorption of the Jew in the fortunes of his nation, his indifference to all but concrete tangible marks of Divine favour, his intense will-power and defective æsthetic sensibility, and (on the other side) the genial, open-minded mentality of the Greek, full of curiosity and enjoyment of nature, an artist to his finger-tips, as the Japanese, and no other nation, are to-day; whose religion was a poetical and symbolical mythology; who lived in a present which he loved to enjoy and ardently desired to understand; who, like a child, craved only to *see* all that is to be seen of this wonderful world and the spiritual mysteries which may lie behind it; whose intellect was so much more developed than his will, that he sincerely believed that to see the truth was to possess it, vice being only ignorance and virtue knowledge; and whose sense of the finer values of life was so keen that he frankly despised unnecessary apparatus, and lived a hardier and healthier life than any civilized race has lived before or since.'

Is this the religion that is the true ancestor of Christianity? No, this is not the religion, and these are not the Greeks. Of these Greeks, the classical Greeks as we call them, few, if any, were left in the time of Christ. The race was all but extinct. It had been swamped in the mongrel horde with which the Roman Empire was filling its Eastern provinces. But as the ancient Greek race died it gave birth to Hellenism. As the classical Greek age passed away, the Hellenistic age came into existence; and when Dr. Inge says that Christianity owes more to the Greeks than to the Jews, he means that it owes more to the Hellenists than to the Hebrews.

For the paradise of the Hebrew was on earth; the paradise of the Hellenist was in heaven: and Christianity preferred the paradise of the Hellenist. The Greek conception of religion, at least in its later form, was a complex of three parts—ritualism, ethics, and mysticism—and Christianity accepted that complex. The Greek (by which he always means now the Hellenist) possessed a symbolical mythology. He possessed also a philosophy which tended more and more to become a strict ethical and devotional discipline, conducting the soul through purification to illumination, and through illumination to the beatific vision of God. Christianity took over both the mythology and the philosophy.

But now Dr. Inge seems to repent a little. He seems to fear that he has taken too much from

the Jew, and given too much to the Greek. Before the essay closes he brings the two races together. He places their religious peculiarities side by side. On the one side stands the Hebrew with his inveterate habit of forcing all ideas into the form of time. On the other side stands the Hellenist whose ideal world was exalted above time. How different, he says, from the Greek mysteries, with their promise of a blessed immortality to the initiated, is the Jewish dream of universal sovereignty over a transfigured earth, with Jerusalem as the world's capital. He now bids us consider these two racial types, utterly unlike each other, as they stand confronted—on the one side, 'Thy sons, O Zion,' on the other, 'Thy sons, O Greece.' And what he sees in the end is these two uniting and begetting 'that strangest product of time,' Catholic Christianity.

And he concludes by asking how it is possible for fire and water thus to coalesce. 'The deepest and truest answer is surely this, that the Divine Founder of Christianity was above the antithesis.' In Christ there is *both Jew and Greek*.

The question of miracles is always with us. Men grow impatient regarding it, but they cannot get rid of it. There is no denying, and there is no longer any possibility of ignoring, the fact that it is simply the miracles that make the difference between the believer in Christ and the unbeliever. The one asserts that not to believe in the resurrection of Christ from the dead is not to believe in Christ. The other answers that resurrection from the dead is a physical impossibility. Thus the gulf is fixed, and no one seems able to discover a way of bridging it.

The Rev. J. H. Skrine has discovered a way. He has been driven to a reconsideration of the subject of miracle 'through the occurrence recently of a practical incident' in the Church of England. The reference, no doubt, is to the startling outcome of the Rev. J. H. Thompson's book on *Miracles in the New Testament*. He starts with the word miracle itself. Antagonists, he says, in order to find a common resting-ground, have resorted to the dictionary. He resorts to the dictionary also. But he does not open the English dictionary. He does not transcribe the ordinary English definition, that a miracle is an occurrence which is not in agreement with the known laws of nature. He opens a Latin dictionary, 'the more elementary the better.' He opens at the word *miraculum*. He finds that *miraculum* is defined as a thing which makes us wonder. That definition of miracle he accepts.

A miracle is a thing which makes us wonder. But what is wonder? It is not the same as surprise. An object that is simply new may excite surprise. A horse which shies at meeting a novel instrument of transport has an emotion of surprise; for animals are as susceptible to surprise as men. But the Chinaman who met the first railway engine in China experienced more than surprise. He experienced wonder; because the thing which he met was mightier than man and all his works. His wonder was a movement of the whole man in response to the stimulus of a thing too great for him. His mind recognized something beyond its compass, his heart felt the throb of fear, his will addressed itself for self-protection.

Now when a Christian receives on his soul the effect of miracle, his feeling is a feeling of wonder. And this wonder is the response of his whole nature to the stimulus of the new, which is greater than he is. It stimulates his thought, and he answers as did the subject of the first Christian miracle, 'How shall this be?' It stimulates his emotions. He seeks to 'love the appearing' of the Divine One who is the agent. It stimulates his will, and he utters the 'Be it unto me according to thy word.' Thus to believe a miracle is to respond to the wonder of it with the whole personality.

Here, then, is the critical moment in the problem of the miraculous. The wonder is before our

eyes—the wonder of the Virgin Birth, or the wonder of the rising from the dead. What response do we make to it? If we repel it, we determine to remain impervious to the intrusion of that which is greater than nature; we refuse communion with the Divine. But if we welcome it, the movement of wonder ends in an act of self-surrender, self-surrender to the new-found greatness in the world which encompasses the soul—and wonder has passed into Faith.

Now as wonder is greater than surprise, so faith is greater than wonder. For wonder may dwindle into incuriousness, it may smoulder to extinction; but, on the other hand, it may grow into conviction, it may flame into life. Then faith comes, and faith remains. And thus faith and unfaith are the respective issues of a miracle, the alternatives of response or refusal of response to the stimulus of a fact which presents itself as the wonderful. Mr. SKRINE claims that this account of the function of miracle in religion differs essentially from the account usually given, that miracle causes belief by operating a breach of natural law and thereby giving evidence that the greater than law is here. 'Our account,' he says, 'differs from this, not by contradicting but by comprehending it; differs from it as the whole differs from a part. We say that miracle proves truth, not by imparting knowledge to the understanding, but by pricking the personality into life.'

Mr. SKRINE then applies this function of miracle to the two most momentous miracles of the New Testament—the Incarnation (or more particularly the Virgin Birth) of our Lord, and His Resurrection from the dead. Accordingly, while the title of his book is *Miracle and History*, the sub-title is 'A Study of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection' (Longmans; 1s. net).

On both miracles Mr. SKRINE has something new to say. Take the Incarnation first. He finds that the word Incarnation is almost invariably used as if it were another name for the Nativity. The Incarnation is supposed to have taken place when Mary gave birth to her Babe, or rather, when she accepted at the Annunciation the action on her of the 'power of the Highest.' But the word has another meaning than that. That is the historic Incarnation. There is also, however, an Incarnation which is timeless. There is a current of Divine action which is always passing along the plane of human existence, and always making for the reconciliation of God and man. Just as in the inanimate world we have the law of Gravitation, and in the animate world the law of Evolution, so in the world of personal existence we have the law of Incarnation.

Now when the Incarnation of the Son of God took place, by His birth of the Virgin Mary, there took place simply one act of that law of Incarnation which is perpetually going on in the world, just as the falling of an apple is one act of the law of gravitation. And so just as the falling of an apple does not contradict but exemplifies the law of gravitation, and therefore is no miracle in the usual English-dictionary meaning of that word, so the Incarnation of Christ is no miracle in that sense. But in the other sense it is a miracle indeed. For it is a cause of unceasing wonder. And through the sense of wonder it works upon the human personality, upon the thoughts, the emotions, and the will of man, until he surrenders to the almightiness of it and responds with saving Faith.

Mr. SKRINE does not mean that every single act of incarnation, that is to say, of reconciliation between God and man, of entrance of God into the life of man and of man into the life of God, must have this result. The wonder of this act is in the greatness of it. And the greatness of it is due to the greatness of Him who became incarnate. In what does His greatness consist?

It consists in this, that while He is a man, He is not any man, but all of Man. Mr. SKRINE does not mean that Jesus exhibited all the varieties of

human character and fortune in His one brief existence. He was not all men in that sense. But He was all manhood in the sense of being in His life's action that which humanity in its essence and perfection is. For in its essence and perfection humanity is the creature of God, realizing wholly the Creator's will, and becoming the thing which God meant when He said, 'Let there be man.' And this is the person that the Christian believes Jesus to have been.

Jesus became what the Creator meant when He said, 'Let us make man,' simply because He realized to the full the Creator's will. And how did He realize it? He realized it by making His life an unreserved sacrifice of self to the Father and to His fellow-men in the Father's name. In His action and in His suffering, from the cradle to the grave, not His will but God's was done. And this sacrifice was a sacrifice which God accepted. That also must be added. In Mr. SKRINE'S words, 'The fire of the Lord fell, and answered the sacrificer's gift by a gift of the Eternal's Self.' Jesus was declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead. This is the object of wonder that ends in Faith. This is the Incarnation that is unique. The Son gave Himself to the Father in the fullness of self-surrender; the Father gave Himself to the Son in the fullness of loving communion.

And now we see the place and necessity of the Jesus of history. Incarnation, which is an eternal principle, is seen on the stage of history in Jesus Christ. Timeless, it enters into time in the Babe found in a manger. We are assured of the principle, when we look upon the fact. The law of gravitation was in existence before Newton saw the apple fall. The fall of the apple gave him experimental assurance of it. The Virgin Birth is no longer a miracle in the old sense of that word, but in the new sense of the word it is a miracle that leads to God.

The second great miracle in Christianity is the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Mr. SKRINE, if we follow him, has already made the way open to an understanding of it. The Resurrection is part of the Incarnation. It is a phase, it is a moment, of that whole Divine action. Mr. SKRINE even places the Resurrection over against the Incarnation as if he held that it also was a timeless principle, the reality of which has been revealed in time by the great act of the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. 'As there was a universal, spiritual, mystical Incarnation,' he says, 'a force by which God for ever and everywhere is drawing His creature Man into union with Himself, while there was also a particular historic Incarnation, an exhibition of that time-long, world-wide force in the actual union of the Divine nature with the human nature of one man Jesus—so is there a spiritual or eternal Resurrection, a force in things by which self-sacrifice causes Soul to live beyond the physical incident called death, and there is also a temporal historic Resurrection, an exhibition of that force once in time through the spectacle of what befell the soul of Jesus who by self-sacrifice lived through death, suffered as behoved the Christ, and entered into His glory.'

The tenet of an ideal or universal Resurrection is not a tenet of Christians only, any more than the tenet of an ideal Incarnation is exclusively theirs. What is specifically Christian is the historic survival of Jesus. It is the fact and not the law that is ours; not the reality of Incarnation or of Resurrection, but their assurance. 'We are not sure of the law that sacrifice makes life until we see it realized in the objective world. It was so realized when one man who was All of Man, did by His sacrifice live on through body's death. Then we learnt that the Spirit of Sacrifice, of which our simpler name is Love, not only is "Lord of All," but this one time was Lord in this one thing of All, the soul of Jesus and His fate. Love whom we had guessed to be strong as death was in a visible trial of strength proved stronger. Christ had loved utterly even unto death, and behold He is alive for evermore.'

Professor Hogg on the Kingdom of God.

By Eugene Stock, D.C.L., London.

In the February number of The Expository Times, a certain 'insignificant-looking book' was pronounced to be 'the most valuable book of the season.' This was *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, by Professor A. G. Hogg of the Madras Christian College. Of that little book I have made a rather careful study, and with the editor's permission I attempt in the present paper a simple account of its contents, without comment of my own. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Hogg's argument, it at least calls for the consideration of Biblical and theological students; and I hope that this slight sketch may serve to introduce it to not a few readers.

The form of the work is notable, and is not at first sight favourable to a just estimate of its importance. It is described on the title-page as 'A Course of Daily Study for Private Students and for Bible Circles'; and it consists of ninety short studies—some very short (even less than a page)—that is, readings for fifteen weeks of six days each; the seventh day in each week being devoted to questions suggested by the six days' study. It is quite a novelty to find a serious theological treatise presented in such a form as this; but the author states that he has done so, not only to render the book suitable for Bible Circles, but also to help the reader to study it in a devotional spirit, carefully comparing the Scripture passages indicated, and not hurrying on with mere speculative inquiries. The Scripture references, which are given at the head of each day's study, are quite extraordinarily apposite; and it is absolutely essential to a true understanding of the book that the reader should not trust to his knowledge, however accurate, of chapter and verse, but should conscientiously look out and read every single text or passage, however familiar. Again and again one is struck by something in them of which one had only partially seen the point, or even not seen it at all.

The main purpose of the book is to answer the question, What was Christ's Message of the Kingdom? He preached 'the Gospel of the Kingdom'; He said, 'the Kingdom is at hand'; more than that, 'The Kingdom is come' (Mt 12^{28}, Lk 11^{20}; cf. Lk 17^{21} R.V., margin). The expression, let me add, occurs in His recorded words 50 times in St. Matthew, 16 times in St. Mark, 35 times in St. Luke, 4 times in St. John. I do not here distinguish between the 'Kingdom of God' and the 'Kingdom of heaven'; but of course Professor Hogg does not ignore the difference. The point is, what did our Lord mean by the phrase, 'the Kingdom is at hand'?

The answer to the question, as given in this book, may be thus stated: (1) In a much more important sense than we generally realize, the Kingdom did actually come as 'a new world-order' in our Lord's day; (2) there was no reason why its consummation should not then have come in the fullest sense, except the sin and unbelief of man; (3) there is no reason, except our unbelief, why we should not be living and acting now under the new world-order which is already present, including the use of the divine power already at the disposal of faith for working what are called miracles; (4) there is no reason, except our own unreadiness, why the full consummation of the Kingdom should not come now, there being no fixed date, near or distant, for that consummation.

It is an illustration of Professor Hogg's spiritual method that the book begins with a whole week of personal application. The opening sentence is characteristic: 'St. Paul could not keep silent.' This alludes to one of the texts referred to just above, Ro 1^{14}, 'I am debtor. . . .' Then, 'He felt himself under obligation to give freely as he had freely received—to tell to any one who would listen of that wondrous new life in Christ into which he had entered, and which had transformed for him the face of the world.' Then, 'The world misunderstands and misjudges the Father. Can His children keep silence?' Various doubts are then noticed, doubts about God meaning what He says,—not conscious or expressed doubts, but doubts evidenced by our conduct. These are illustrated from the O.T. Gn 3 is referred to ('Yea, hath God said?'); and the 88th Psalm as a picture of utter darkness; and various complaints in other Psalms.

The Second Week, which is entitled 'The

Vindication of Jehovah,' takes us again to the O.T., and refers us to various passages predicting the coming Kingdom or 'Messianic age,' which would be the vindication of God amid the perplexities and problems of life and death. Among the passages cited is the 74th Psalm, with its picture of disaster and distress, and in the very middle of it (v.[12]), 'Yet God is my King of old.' It is shown from the Psalms and Isaiah that the ideas of O.T. times about the coming Kingdom were progressively enlarging. At first, only national prosperity; then a restoration of Eden, and the abolition of sin and death; then, in view of the natural question, But what about those already dead? hints (Is 27, Dn 12) of a future resurrection. Dn 7 is cited as showing that the expected Kingdom was no mere earthly development, but was to be supernatural: 'The man-like figure "comes with the clouds of heaven."'

Then, in the Third Week, comes the question, 'Why does it tarry?' which is the title of the Week's Study. The Book of Job is cited to show that one object of the delay may be the discipline or training of God's people. Another reason would be the need of atonement, as shown in Is 53. But coming to the New Testament, we find both John the Baptist and our Lord saying the Kingdom is 'at hand'; and an interesting study of their words is undertaken, to show that they referred to the same Kingdom, and to the same time of its coming. The teaching of the Week is thus summed up:—

> '(1) By the coming of the Kingdom Christ meant the same event as the Apocalyptists meant, viz. the arrival of a new age, when God would at last let Himself act in the way in which faith had always felt it only natural that He should act, giving His omnipotence free play in the service of His righteousness,—an age in which therefore supernatural forces would be available for the conquest of suffering evil, and sin.'
>
> '(2) He announced this Kingdom as close at hand—indeed in some respects (viz. in the availableness of supernatural forces) as already present. . . .
>
> '(3) He described the present phase of the Kingdom as a process of gradual growth, but did not thereby exclude the present phase from terminating in a sudden crisis of fulfilment.'

And yet, 'it appears so obvious that the Kingdom had *not* yet arrived.' What, then, did Christ's Now mean? The answer is expressed in the title of the Fourth Week, 'It need not Tarry.' 'May the Kingdom not really have been at hand—not merely that beginning of it which actually came to pass, but its consummation too? May it not have been the incredible obstinacy of human distrust that needlessly prevented what might really have taken place?' God, in fact, was always ready, but man was not. But by the Incarnation a Man appeared whose perfect life and absolute trust in His Father introduced the new world-order.

At this point emerges one of the chief teachings of the book. The author takes a strong view of what is called the *kenosis*. He is an absolutely orthodox believer in the Deity of Christ. 'God the Son became Man'; 'He was Very God'; 'God Incarnate,'—these are among his emphatic statements on that fundamental doctrine. But he holds that God the Son 'emptied Himself' more completely at the Incarnation than the average Christian has been accustomed to think. He takes our Lord's words in their most literal sense; such words as 'I can of Mine own self do nothing,' 'The thing which I speak, even as the Father said unto Me, so I speak,' and other similar utterances. He particularly lays stress upon the mysterious words in Mk 13[32] (also in the R.V. of Mt 24[36]), 'Neither the Son.' He points out, indeed, that this very passage implies the Son's unique greatness. 'Of that day and hour knoweth (1) no one; (2) not even the angels in heaven; (3) neither the Son'—the Son standing alone. Yet he will not explain away the plain statement that Jesus *did not know*. And his belief evidently is that his view, so far from detracting from the unique greatness of the Son of God, enhances it by magnifying His condescension.

Relying on our Lord's words, Professor Hogg draws a remarkable picture of what may have been in His mind during His earthly life and ministry; dwelling, as so many modern writers do, but with a reverent devotion not too common among them, upon the gradually growing consciousness of Jesus of His divine mission. Mr. Hogg does not, as some do, defer all that sacred consciousness till the Baptism. He infers from the narrative of Jesus being found in the Temple that 'the uniquely intimate filial consciousness of God which He manifested throughout His public ministry went

back to His earliest years,' but thinks that it was the baptismal revelation that assured Him of His Messianic office. Then Mr. Hogg suggests that He 'hoped' and 'expected' the immediate, or at least speedy, consummation of the Kingdom. 'He knew that with the Father all things were possible—that nothing could be too glorious for God. Would He not then have been false to His Father if He had counted an early consummation unlikely? . . . Is it not we ourselves who blaspheme God when we assume that the end necessarily was and necessarily is far off?'

Professor Hogg urges that this 'adds to the story of the life of Christ an absorbing human interest.' 'It gives a new moving power to' certain passages 'by permitting us to interpret them in their natural sense as expressions of genuine disappointment.' For instance, the weeping over Jerusalem, 'If thou hadst known, even thou,' and the words, 'O Jerusalem . . . how often would I . . .' How far more pathetic these words—such is Mr. Hogg's contention—if they express, not merely sorrow for a rejection which was always before Him as a matter of course, but grief for a sin which He had fondly hoped might have been averted; and how much deeper our sense of His love!

But if it be granted that the Lord might have so laid aside His divine knowledge as to be liable to such disappointment of genuine hopes, the question arises, why should He expect any other issue of His ministry?

First, because of 'the limitless power of God'; and, secondly, 'it was difficult for Him to believe that men could long remain deaf to such a wondrous message from the Father.' This is illustrated by a verse which Mr. Hogg twice puts at the head of the Daily Studies, Mk 6^6, 'He *marvelled* because of their unbelief.' How could He 'marvel' if He knew it all beforehand? Even when He perceived the certainty of His rejection and death, that death, and the resurrection which was to follow, 'would surely give to the message an irresistible power,' and the consummation would quickly follow (cf. Jn 12^{24}, the 'corn of wheat' . . . bearing much fruit, and the declaration just after, 'I, if I be lifted up,' etc.). 'We may,' says Mr. Hogg, 'venture to suppose that our Lord began His public ministry with a solemn consciousness on the one hand that the establishment of the Kingdom *might* cost a criminal tragedy like that foreshadowed in Is 53, but on the other hand with the great and glad hope (of which we seem to see the last flicker in the Gethsemane prayer) that the Father, with whom all things were possible, might . . . fulfil His gracious purpose toward mankind in some way less grievously tarnished by human sin and guilt.' 'Ought we not,' adds Mr. Hogg, 'to feel convicted of unbelief if we have at all felt that His hope was unwarrantable?' And he gives us for reference Mt 17^{20}, Mk 9^{23} 10^{27}.

If, then, we may venture to think that Jesus did 'hope' or 'expect' a speedy consummation, then '*it really might have been fulfilled.*' 'Since we cannot ascribe any fickle wavering of purpose to God, it follows that if the date of the consummation was really uncertain, this must have been because God intended it to depend upon the attitude of man.' 'God will not bind Himself by any prediction as to the time of the consummation, but reserves to Himself full freedom (Ac 1^7) to send it *whenever* He sees that human conditions are ripe for it (Mk 4^{29}).'

Therefore, the answer to the question, Why did the Kingdom tarry? and why does it tarry now? is, *It need not have tarried then*, and *it need not tarry now.*

Then follow Studies for two weeks, entitled 'The Kingdom as Present' and 'The Kingdom of Glory.' Under the former head the whole question of Miracles is discussed. 'For many N.T. scholars,' writes Mr. Hogg, 'the presumption that miracles do not happen has become a guiding principle of criticism. The Christian on the other hand should proceed on the assumption that unless the message of the Kingdom is a false message, miracles are to be expected.' Christ and the New Age had begun. How, then, would we expect Him to act? We should expect Him (1) to be 'content with ordinary agencies whenever these sufficed for His purposes, because the Messianic Age was not to be something absolutely different from all that had gone before, but was only to supplement and perfect it.' (2) But when ordinary agencies were not sufficient, He 'would freely draw upon the infinite resources of God.' (3) He would 'look upon the fact that supernatural (that is, unprecedented) agencies did actually operate at His desire as furnishing an irrefragable proof of the truth of His message.' (4) He 'would regard the use of these supernatural powers of the Messianic

age as no peculiar privilege of His own, but as open to all.' To illustrate this the Gospel narratives are examined; and I may perhaps condense the resulting conclusions as follows:—

(*a*) Our Lord often healed men without recourse to 'miracle.' The evidence from the Gospels for this statement is remarkable, and worth careful study. The conclusion is, 'Christ's ministry of healing was a work in which He used the curative applications of His day, drawing upon supernatural agencies only as a supplementary resource'; 'it therefore made heavy demands upon His time and physical strength'; 'He felt the need of constant prayer to keep Himself spiritually in tone for the acts of faith involved in His more striking cures' (Mk 9^{29}).

(*b*) The real 'miracles' were *not* 'a breach of order.' If a new supernatural order was present, 'it must manifest its presence in supernatural occurrences.'

(*c*) There was no limit to the possible use by Christ of supernatural powers. It was for seeing this that He praised the centurion; and Mt 26^{53} shows His 'utterly unlimited claims . . . upon His Father's resources.'

(*d*) 'The miracles both of Christ and in the Early Church were an indispensably necessary evidence of the truth of the Gospel.'

(*e*) The account of our Lord's Temptation shows that 'miracles' are not to be wrought either for private ends or to convince sceptics. 'While He estimated very highly the evidential value of His miracles for those who had the rudiments of faith,' He knew that 'where this was absent miracles had no educative value (Lk 16^{31}),' and indeed created excitement, distracting attention from His teaching. Hence His frequent injunctions to those who were healed not to tell others about it.

(*f*) A note here refers to other kinds of miracles, the water made wine, the stilling of the tempest, the walking on the sea, the draughts of fishes. 'All these,' says Mr. Hogg, 'are cases where a striking interference with the natural order is brought to pass, not for the sake of averting tragedy or curing grievous pain, but for ends which at first seem ordinary. Only a kingly soul could feel it natural to expend such resources on such objects. They impress us as regal acts.'

So much for our Lord's miracles. But Professor Hogg further contends that as we are living in the Messianic age under a new supernatural world-order, Christ's words in Mt 17 and Mk 11 are literally true: 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you'; and 'Have faith in God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever . . . shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass; he shall have it. . . . All things whatsoever,' etc. 'Miracles in the Christian sense,' he says, 'and prayer, are just the outer and inner aspects of the same fact—that the universe is not a fixed mechanical system, but a Messianic order in which the unlimited resources of God are freely available to us for all right ends.' How keen was Christ's disappointment at the disciples' failure at the foot of the mount of Transfiguration! 'With this cry ringing in our ears, let us look back over our own past efforts to benefit our fellow-men, and ask whether our lives have been a fulfilment of Jn 15^{16}—"I chose you, and appointed you, that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in My Name, He may give it you."'

On the subject of 'the Kingdom of glory,' Professor Hogg says that if the Kingdom in its present phase is 'the dawning of a new world-order,' 'much more will the perfected phase include a transformation of the entire known universe.' He considers that our popular notions of 'heaven' have hindered us from perceiving this and much more. 'As the Kingdom is the perfecting of earth, with victory over all forces of evil, decay, and death, so life in the Kingdom is the perfecting of earthly life with immunity from sin and disease and death.' One passage I must quote in full:

> 'Let us recollect what the consummated Kingdom of God means. It means an order of things in which God will at last act in the way in which faith has always felt it only natural that He should act, letting His omnipotence have free play in the service of His goodness, for the perfecting of the world and the abolition of every curse.
>
> 'But if this be so, then obviously those who live in the consummated Kingdom will have an omnipotent bulwark against all forces of evil, including death. Life in the Kingdom will therefore be immortal. Its immortality will not be due to any inherent metaphysical

indestructibleness of the soul, but will be a consequence of the consummation of the Kingdom—a consequence accruing, therefore, only to those who are members of the Kingdom. Moreover, since the Kingdom means the perfecting of earth, life in the Kingdom must include the perfecting of our rich human life. In fact, the more truly precious any earthly relationship appears to us, the more confident may we be that this will be preserved and perfected in the eternal Kingdom. Is not this a satisfying gospel?

Then follow four weekly Studies, entitled 'The Reign of God,' 'Unworldliness and Other-Worldliness,' 'The Unworldly Life,' 'The Goal of Endeavour.' 'We pass,' says the author, 'from the question of what difference the establishment of the Kingdom makes *to* man, and begin to study the difference it makes *in* man.' Under the first head, 'The Reign of God,' he dwells on the character and conduct of the community of members of the Kingdom, expounding our Lord's teaching about 'meekness and humble service' being 'the only title to rank and authority,' about treatment of erring members and of wrong-doers who are outsiders, about 'rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' etc. 'In any State the institutions of which do not perfectly conform to these principles, the sons of the kingdom must feel themselves not wholly citizens, but in some degree "strangers and pilgrims."' A good deal in these Studies reminds one of *Ecce Homo*.

Turning from the community to the individual, Mr. Hogg next reviews Christ's attitude to external religious observances, asceticism, marriage and family life, social reform, the ethics of trade, property, etc. His great point is that, although we are 'strangers and pilgrims,' we are not to be 'other-worldly,' but 'unworldly.' This is all put in a very interesting way, but need not detain us. I will only quote one sentence from the passages about the future life and marriage: 'All that is deep and spiritual in the marriage relationship will be continued and perfected in the age to come, because that age is not another world but this world regenerated.'

Passing over a week's Studies on 'The Goal of Endeavour,' and another on 'Divine Transcendence,' we come to a week on 'Fatherhood and Sonship.' And here, again, we meet the question of our Lord's knowledge and foreknowledge. One of the Studies is a very remarkable one. 'Shall we venture to-day,' it begins, 'to speculate reverently concerning the way in which the filial consciousness which our Lord possessed from the first prepared the way for His apparently later consciousness of Himself as Messiah? From the outset He thought of God as Father in the rich ethical senseillustrated in the parable of the Prodigal, and at the same time as the incomparable, transcendent Lord.' What influence would this have on the thoughts about the coming of the Messianic age which He would share with the pious Jewish circle in which He was brought up? Would He not think, Why does it not come? We may naturally suppose, suggests Mr. Hogg, that He would entertain three thoughts: (1) 'the Father desires to establish the Kingdom'; (2) 'for His infinitude nothing is too difficult'; (3) yet, 'just because He is Father, He will not force the human will.' What would be the inference? 'That the Father is always willing to usher in the perfect world-order,' and 'that the Kingdom might have come at any time but for man's unfitness.' Then, 'realizing that no one else had a consciousness of and trust in the Father at all approaching His own,' He would, even before the Baptism, perceive that the Father meant *Him* to be the Messiah, who, 'by His own faith, and by awakening like faith in others, would make it possible for the Father to' fulfil His purpose. This striking Study closes with a few humble and reverent words: 'We have been trying to conceive the course of Christ's inner consciousness, and we may feel quite sure that we have fallen very far short of the truth, for "no one knoweth the Son save the Father." . . . Yet is not even the little glimpse into His mind which we seem to ourselves to have obtained to-day full of inspiring suggestiveness?'

The last two Weeks are headed 'A Ransom for Many' and 'It is Finished,' and bring us to the supreme topic of our Lord's Death and Resurrection. The former begins by quoting in full the great passage, Is 52^{13}–53^{12}. We need not imagine, says Mr. Hogg, what the prophet intended to convey. The point is how Christ applied it to Himself. He 'heard the Father call Him to fulfil that Servant's mission and destiny in His own Person'; and some interesting verbal affinities are pointed out between His language and the language of the prophecy.

But a strong point is made of the fact that our Lord announced His Resurrection with the same exactness and emphasis as His Death. So His mission was not merely to die. It was to die *and to rise from the dead.* 'I lay down My life, *that I may take it again*'; and this, as Mr. Hogg also points out, Is 53 plainly predicts. One object, then, of His death was *to conquer death by rising again.* It was 'the resurrection of One who had been announcing the arrival of a new age in which for faith all things were possible—who had claimed that His own miracles were evidences of its presence—*who had foretold* that though He was about to submit to death He would rise again—and who then did actually die, unmistakably and by violence, *and fulfilled His prediction.*'

But what made His soul 'exceeding sorrowful'? Mr. Hogg sets aside the ordinary explanation, for which, in his opinion, the only evidence is the Cry from the Cross, and that cry, he urges, was 'not a cry of despair,' but 'the self-preserving cry of faith as it reels under the assault of despair.' And in the next Study he suggests that the 'agony' was caused by His 'horror at the sin of man in crucifying the Messiah, His grief at all that this sin would cost mankind in days to come'—*e.g.* 'Weep not for Me, but for yourselves and for your children.' 'When we realize the wild carnival of sin that makes up the story of the end, . . . can we wonder that in the garden our Lord shrank in every fibre of His being from the voluntary surrender which was to evoke all this guilt?'

One other reason for Christ's death is suggested, which cannot be put in a few words. It must suffice to quote two passages. 'In relation to sinfulness which is still obstinate and impenitent, God cannot satisfy His holiness by any weaker expression of His opposition to sin than that which is afforded by voluntarily, willingly, letting sinners vent their utmost hate upon Himself.' 'Is not this the final secret?' 'Not so much by suffering the punishment of sinners (though that also is in one sense true, since all suffering is in its origin the penal consequence of sin), as by enabling sinners openly to vent their malice against God Himself, our Lord made atonement and satisfied the righteousness of God.' This, I confess, is not very clear; nor, to me, is the further exposition of the subject, nor the illustration from the Christian treatment of unrepenting offenders enjoined by our Lord in Mt 18. But I have not space to enter into the subject further. I will only note the absence of any direct reference to 'propitiation'; and I venture to ask, Without *that*, can we arrive at 'the final secret'?

We now come to the last Study, 'It is Finished.' In what sense, asks Mr. Hogg, could Christ feel or say 'It is finished'? The answer is, (1) 'Atonement had been made.' He had gone as a lamb to the slaughter, and now in sure faith He looked forward to a resurrection in which He should find that His soul had been made an offering for sin, and should see the pleasure of the Lord prosper in His hand.' (2) The New Covenant of Jer 31 had been introduced. (3) The way was ready for the 'full outpouring of the Spirit.' (4) The Church, the new Israel, had been founded. The last day's Study dwells on the Lord's promise of His spiritual presence, in Mt 18, 'Where two or three,' etc., and in Mt 28, 'Lo, I am with you alway.' Then, 'Do we here reach the summit of Christ's message of the Kingdom?' 'No, this unseen presence remains something less than the uttermost goal of His mission.' 'He is with us unseen "*unto the consummation of the age*," but *then* unseen no longer' (Mk 14^{62}, '*Ye shall see* the Son of Man'; the 'henceforth' of Matthew and Luke being taken as an interpolation). 'He will come "in the glory of His Father," invisible no longer.' 'Let not us, therefore, be like the mockers who say, "Where is the promise of His coming? . . . For the Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some count slackness; but is long-suffering."' So the book closes.

I have abstained from commenting on the views set forth in this remarkable work, and in closing I only wish to make one remark. It seems to me that we are not told what it is that would be necessary for the consummation of the Kingdom to 'tarry' no longer, but to come now. Mr. Hogg's answer would probably be 'sufficient faith in God's people,' and it seems impertinent to rejoin, 'But how much?' Yet, as he does assume the existence still, when the great day comes, of finally impenitent souls, he probably expects much the same variety of spiritual attainment as at present; and one wonders, if in the purposes of God the date depends on human readiness, what may be the necessary degree and extent of that readiness. As far as I can see, the book does not suggest a solution of this problem. Nevertheless, it is a great and an inspiring book.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ISAIAH.

Isaiah liii. 2.

For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground.—R.V.

1. *He grew.*—The tense is the perfect of prophetic certitude; all has been finished 'before the foundation of the world' in the Divine counsels.

2. *Before him.*—He grew up '*before him*,' before the face of Jehovah Himself. We picture some sequestered nook, remote from the din and clamour of the crowd; and we think of a childhood spent amid the quiet, sweet, balmy influences of a human home, with nature around, the child cast into the fellowship of lowly people and simple scenes, and growing up under the eye of God Himself.

3. *A tender plant, a root out of a dry ground.*—Men expected a 'plant of renown,' fairer and statelier than all the trees in the garden of God, with boughs lifted cedar-like in majesty; instead, there is a suckling, a sprout from the root of a tree that had been cut down, with nothing fair or magnificent about it. It owes nothing to the soil in which it grows. The ground is dry, an arid waste without moisture; the plant is a tender one; and in that unpropitious soil, whence no sweet juices can be drawn, it grows up stunted, dwarfed, unattractive. That is the figure.

Some time ago, as I travelled through one of the Welsh mining valleys, my eye fell upon three or four trees that were growing out of the very midst of a hill of coal waste. It was a most unlikely place in which to see a tree growing at all, and I marvelled at the vitality that could exist amid such surroundings. But I also noticed that it was a very precarious and poverty-stricken existence these trees on the coal heap were leading. Compared with the trees that were growing in the green and fertile fields near by, they were poor and sickly-looking specimens. It is hopeless to expect a strong, vigorous, beautiful plant to spring out of a 'dry ground.'[1]

The meaning is missed in the lines:

> Fair as a beauteous, tender flower
> Amid the desert grows,
> So, slighted by a rebel race,
> The Heavenly Saviour rose.

Not *that*; not a beauteous, tender flower, growing fair in some desert spot, lending desolation a charm; but a tender sapling growing in unfriendly soil, far away from 'the scent of waters,' sickly, dwarfed, without beauty. The idea is more nearly caught in the other lines:

> Like a tender plant that's growing
> Where no waters, kindly flowing,
> No kind rains, refresh the ground,
> Drooping, dying, ye shall view Him,
> See no charm to draw you to Him,
> There no beauty shall be found.[2]

[1] J. D. Jones, *The Hope of the Gospel*, 1.

I.

The Soil.

In this moving chapter the prophet, by the Spirit, speaks of Christ. And this is one feature about the Christ which he notices—His unexpectedness, His unaccountableness, His miraculousness. He grew up before Him as a 'root out of a dry ground.' There was nothing in the soil out of which He grew to account for Jesus.

An Italian nobleman during the stern reign of Napoleon underwent a long imprisonment. He had drunk deep of the cold rationalism of the eighteenth century and went to prison an atheist. As he paced his little court he noticed one day a slight disturbance of its hard clay floor. Then in a few days a glistening point pushed itself up through the clay and the mortar. As these rough impediments were got over, the hard sheath opened out and a delicate plant shot up into the air. The prisoner watched from day to day with deep interest the growth of the little plant, the expanding of leaves that had been daintily folded in their protecting case, the issuing of a carefully covered bud which opened out, petal after petal, into a lovely flower with provision in its calyx for the infinite renewal of the plant's life. And through the teaching of this 'lily of the field,' the atheist left his prison a believer in his Father's wisdom and his Father's love.[3]

1. There is nothing in the *Surroundings* of Jesus to account for Him. You cannot explain His greatness on the ground of early advantages, for He had none. The Jews were surprised. 'Whence hath this man these things?' they asked. 'Is not this the carpenter?' 'How knoweth this man letters,' they asked on another occasion, 'having never learned?' They thought of our Lord's home, they thought of His education, they thought of Nazareth, they thought of those years in the workshop; and then they thought of

[2] J. Culross, *The Man of Sorrows*, 78.

[3] F. R. Wynne, *The Literature of the Second Century*, 92.

His words of grace, His deeds of power, and His life of absolute holiness, and it left them utterly and hopelessly bewildered. There was nothing in His upbringing and surroundings to account for Him. As far as His environment was concerned, He grew up as a 'root out of a dry ground.'

2. Jesus derived nothing from His *Nationality*; it was no general recommendation to His teaching that He was of the seed of Abraham. Why, to this day, to many minds, it is almost shameful to mention that our Saviour was a Jew. Though certainly the Jew is of an honourable race, ancient and venerable, as having been chosen by God of old, yet among the sons of men the name of Jew has not yet lost the opprobrium which long ages of cruel oppression and superstitious hate have cast upon it. There was no nation, immediately after the time of our Saviour, that the Romans ardently hated except the Jews. The Romans were peculiarly tolerant of all religions and customs; by conquest their empire had absorbed men of all languages and creeds, and they usually left them undisturbed: but the Jewish faith was too peculiar and intolerant to escape derision and hatred. After the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, the Jews were hunted down, and the connexion of Christianity with Judaism, so far from being an advantage to it, became a serious hindrance to its growth. Christianity was confounded with Judaism, and made to share the political obloquy of the Jewish nation as well as its own reproach. Had our Saviour been born in Greece, there is no doubt that as a religious teacher He would have commanded far more attention than as coming forward from Jerusalem or Nazareth. He owed nothing to His Jewish birth, for if anything good could have come out of Israel in former days, behold into what a state it had fallen,—it was dead politically, religiously, and mentally!

3. There is nothing even in *the Human Race* to explain Jesus. The race has produced great teachers and leaders like Confucius, and Buddha, and Mahomet, and Plato, and Socrates. But the fact that the race produced Confucius, and Buddha, and Mahomet, and Socrates, and Plato, and Dante, and Shakespeare does not make it a whit easier to understand how it could produce Jesus. For in the matter of wisdom and truth, a whole universe separates Jesus from the best and wisest of other teachers. There are falsities mixed up with their wisdom, but the wisdom of Jesus is all pure gold. We outgrow their teaching. The teaching of Jesus, after nineteen centuries, remains our wonder and our inspiration. Others guess at truth. Jesus talks about the eternities in the calm and assured accents of full and perfect knowledge.

'A root out of a dry ground.' Some miles from Cairo, right in the desert, standing absolutely by itself, is a large palm tree, known locally as 'The Lone Palm Tree.' It is about four miles from the river Nile, and no one knows how it lives or whence it derives the moisture necessary for its sustenance. Visitors go to see it and discuss the mystery of its existence. Not less arid and barren than the desert of Sahara was the world of humanity from which miraculously sprang the Messiah, deriving His being, His powers, His mission from the hidden springs of Deity.

II.

The Plant.

The marvel of Christ's Person becomes all the more marvellous when we consider the conditions of His time and the circumstances out of which He sprang. The nature of the growth is always in accordance with the nature of the soil. You cannot expect a harvest from seed that falls on the rocky ground. If things grow at all out of dry and hard ground, they are bound to be feeble and sickly growths. But Jesus was no feeble and sickly growth. He was the 'chiefest among ten thousand,' and the 'altogether lovely.' He was like the cedar of Lebanon for strength, like the lily of the valley for fragrance and purity, like the rose of Sharon for glory. By universal consent He was the best and noblest, and the highest and holiest of mankind. And yet He grew up as a root out of a dry ground. There was nothing in His circumstances or surroundings to account for Him or explain Him. He is as surprising, as inexplicable, as miraculous, as would be, let us say, a crop of flowers springing up out of the asphalt paving of our public streets.

Owing to their geographical position, the central and western regions of South Africa are almost constantly deprived of rain. They contain no flowing streams, and very little water in the wells. The soil is a soft and light-coloured sand, which reflects the sunlight with a glaring intensity. No fresh breeze cools the air; no passing cloud veils the scorching sky. We should naturally have supposed that regions so scantily supplied with one of the first necessaries of life could be nothing else than waste and lifeless deserts; and yet, strange to say, they are distinguished for their comparatively abundant vegetation, and their immense development of animal life. The evil produced by want of rain has been counteracted by the admirable foresight of the

Creator, in providing these arid lands with plants suited to their trying circumstances. The vegetation is eminently local and special. Nothing like it is seen elsewhere on the face of the earth. Nearly all the plants have tuberous roots, buried far beneath the ground, beyond the scorching effects of the sun, and are composed of succulent tissue, filled with a deliciously cool and refreshing fluid. They have also thick fleshy leaves, with pores capable of imbibing and retaining moisture from a very dry atmosphere and soil; so that if a leaf be broken during the greatest drought, it shows abundant circulating sap. Nothing can look more unlike the situations in which they are found than these succulent roots, full of fluid when the surrounding soil is dry as dust, and the enveloping air seems utterly destitute of moisture; replete with nourishment and life when all within the horizon is desolation and death. They seem to have a special vitality in themselves; and, unlike all other plants, to be independent of circumstances. Such roots are also found in the deserts of Arabia; and it was doubtless one of them that suggested to the prophet the beautiful and expressive emblem of the text, 'He shall grow up before him as a root out of a dry ground.'[1]

1. Christ created the gospel by His work; He preaches the gospel by His words; He is the gospel Himself. His Person is intrinsically superior to all the doctrines which He proclaims, and all the blessings which He confers. His individuality takes precedence of everything else. He is the Way; for no man cometh to the Father but by Him. He is the Truth; for the truth that frees and sanctifies the soul is 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' He is the Life; for he that believeth in Him, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and to know Him is life everlasting. He of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; and the believer is said to 'put on Christ,' and not merely His salvation, to be made 'a partaker of Christ,' and not merely of His gifts, whether of grace or glory. In short, there are numerous passages in the New Testament which declare Christ *to be personally* what, in the ordinary language of life, we should say that He had done and taught and communicated.

2. All the individual life of the Christian, with its blossoms of holiness and its fruits of righteousness; all the Christian life of society, with its things that are pure, and honest, and lovely, and of good report, is but a development and a manifestation of the life of Christ in the heart and in the world; a growth and unfolding of the power, the beauty, and the sweetness that are hid in the root of Jesse. And it is assuredly the most precious, as it is the most distinguishing, feature of the Christian religion, that it places the foundation of eternal life in living relations with a living person, rather than in the profession of a creed or the practice of a duty; that under it the believer is 'not a man who maintains the doctrine of the Trinity, or who holds justification by faith, but the man who has come to Christ, and is rooted and built up in Him.'

3. Among the problems which most occupy the minds of men to-day are problems which have to do with the work and Person of Jesus Christ. From whatever point of view we regard Him, this much we have to concede, that He is a spiritual force of the first magnitude, that He has produced results so vast and far-reaching as almost to defy computation, that He stands out from the page of history unique and incalculable. And such effects as these imply a cause sufficient to produce them. There must have been in Christ, or behind Christ, some power capable of doing the work. When we compare the Jesus of our Gospels, the work He did and the estimate in which He was held by His contemporaries, with the Christ of history, and the position which He holds to-day, there is nothing unreasonable in the assumption of the Incarnation, that He was God manifest in the flesh. No one can doubt that this is an assumption sufficient to account for the facts. The only question is whether any lesser assumption—any one involving fewer demands upon our faith—can do the same.[2]

What, then, shall we say of Jesus? There is only one thing that can be said of Him. He is not the product of the race. He is the gift of God. Start from purely human considerations, and Jesus remains as big a problem and as hopeless and insoluble a riddle as a root out of a dry ground. But my difficulties vanish, and I can understand Jesus when, with the Holy Church, I say that Jesus does not represent so much the ascent of man, as the descent of God; not so much the climbing of the human into the Divine, as the condescension of the Divine to the human; that His birth was not a mere birth, but an Incarnation; that Jesus is not simply Son of Mary, but Immanuel, God with us. 'I say,' said Browning, and I say it with him:

> I say, the acknowledgement of God in Christ
> Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
> All questions in the earth and out of it.[3]

[1] H. Macmillan, *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 210.

[2] W. B. Selbie, *The Servant of God*, 30.

[3] J. D. Jones, *The Hope of the Gospel*, 13.

Ethics among Primitive Peoples.

By A. C. Haddon, M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S., Fellow of Christ's College and University Reader in Ethnology, Cambridge.

In attempting to understand the laws which govern the conduct of primitive peoples, Western standards of morality must be entirely set aside, lest one fall into the error of past generations, who proclaimed the savage to be an immoral or even an unmoral being. As a matter of fact, the savage is bound by very rigid rules of conduct, which arise out of the sheer necessity for maintaining the solidarity of the community, since in the struggle for existence under adverse conditions man as individual could never survive; indeed, it may well be that man's social instinct was a powerful factor in his emergence from the anthropoid state. Despite the views of Lang and Atkinson (*Social Origins*, 1903) and others, it may be reasonably held, with Kropotkin (*Mutual Aid*, 1902), that, apart from modifications in physical structure, the social development of man was very largely dependent upon the fact that he was a relatively weak and defenceless animal, but no doubt endued with that strong sense of sociability which engendered in him the social habits which characterize all gregarious animals. At a stage of man's fuller development the conditions would obtain which Westermarck has described (*Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 1906, i. pp. 538–39): 'It may be said that, as a general rule, among savages and barbarians—with the exception, perhaps, of those who live in small family-groups—as also among the peoples of archaic culture, this duty [of assisting more distant relatives] is more prominent and extends further than amongst ourselves. The blood-tie has much greater strength, related families keep more closely together for mutual protection and aid.' The morality of primitive man is essentially social; the conduct of the individual must be regulated for the common good by immutable rules handed down from generation to generation. Thus savages are found to be intensely conservative and law-abiding folk. The good man is he who conforms strictly to that standard of conduct which by past experience has proved beneficial to society; that which is subversive of custom, disruptive, anti-social, is bad: hence the suspicion with which any innovation is regarded by chiefs and those concerned in the maintenance of communal integrity. For humanity in these early stages the idea of individual morality is practically absent; it is a later development arising out of a growing self-consciousness. M. Durkheim and the French school of anthropologists are justified in assuming that 'in early society there was a solidarity in the actions of men as members of a social group which gave those actions a quite specific character, and makes it wholly illegitimate to suppose that they were directed by motives of the same order which set into activity the individual; and they assert that the explanation of the facts of early society is to be sought in social conditions which have as their psychological correlate or expression what they call collective representations' (Rivers, *Hibbert Journal*, x. [1912], p. 394). Primitive thought, according to Lévy-Bruhl, is totally distinct in its processes from that of civilized man, being characterized, *inter alia*, by what he terms the law of participation. 'Representations called collective,' writes Lévy-Bruhl (*Les fonctions mentales des sociétés inférieures*, 1910, p. 1), '. . . may be recognized by the following indications: they are common to the members of a given social group; they are transmitted from generation to generation; they are enjoined on individuals and awaken in them feelings of respect, fear, adoration, etc., as the case may be. They are not dependent on the individual for existence. Not that they imply a collective subject distinct from the individuals composing the social group, but because they possess characters which cannot be accounted for solely by the consideration of individuals as such.' As regards the law of participation the same writer says (p. 77): 'In the collective representations of primitive mentality objects, beings, phenomena, may be, in a manner incomprehensible to us, at the same time themselves and other than themselves. . . . For this mentality the opposition between one and several, the same and the other, etc., does not necessitate the affirmation of one of these terms if the other be denied, and reciprocally. . . . Often it melts away before a mystic community of essence between

beings which to our ideas could not be blended together without absurdity.' The primitive mind is prelogical in that for it connexions exist where to our minds there are none. This law of participation accounts for the effect on the child of food eaten by the father, the effect on an individual of sorcery worked by means of his hair or nail-parings, the effect on the crops or the weather of ceremonies performed by certain persons. It is the mystic participation of the individual in the community which underlies much that is puzzling to the Western mind in the ideas and institutions of savages.

We have seen that the moral law of savages is entirely social in its objective; he who fails in his observance of it commits an offence against the community, but at the outset there appears to be no idea of responsibility to any outside authority against whom a man sins in breaking the moral law. Morality is as yet perfectly distinct from religion even of the most rudimentary form, which may be defined as the acknowledgment of and dependence upon superhuman powers whether spirits or divinities. Professor Westermarck, in his chapter on 'Gods as Guardians of Morality' (*op. cit.* ii. p. 663), points out that it is by no means a universal characteristic of gods to punish vice and reward virtue, for the supernatural beings of savage belief frequently display the utmost indifference to questions of worldly morality. Ritual neglect might offend them as being sacrilegious, but otherwise they take no account of human conduct. On the other hand, many backward peoples are stated to have a belief in an 'All-father,' who may be a mythical ancestor or headman, and as such may take an interest in the morality of his descendants. Some Australian tribes now regard him as the original source of totemic and other regulations, breaches of which he will visit with punishment (A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S.E. Australia*, 1904, pp. 488–508; K. Langloh Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, 1905, pp. 7–9). In fact, he may be to that extent a kind of personification of the collective conscience, aiding the efforts of the elders to maintain the ancient order of things. Mr. Howitt said of the S.E. Australian tribes (*Jour. Anth. Inst.* xiii. [1884], p. 459): '. . . . I venture to assert that it can no longer be maintained that they have no belief which can be called religious—that is, in the sense of beliefs which govern tribal and individual morality under a supernatural sanction.' This is borne out by his later work cited above (pp. 489, 495). The high-god 'is the Headman in the sky-country, the analogue of the Headman of the tribe on the earth' (p. 491). The law-breaker incurs not the wrath of the gods but the disapproval of society, and it is to his fellow-men, or possibly to the sorcerer, that the injured party turns for help in obtaining redress. Primitive sexual morality clearly reveals this point of view: chastity *per se* is of no account, therefore the relations of young people before marriage are often subject to no restrictions; but, once a man has married a woman and paid over the bride-price to her family, he has established rights over her, any infringement of which is tantamount to theft of another man's property. The perpetrator of such an act, according to savage ideas, is not guilty of the sin of adultery—such a thing does not exist—but he has committed the crime of theft. It must be further borne in mind that the primitive ethical code enjoins practices directly opposed to Western sexual morality. In certain Australian tribes it is recognized that, though the husband has prior claim to his own wife, yet other men of his totemic kin have accessory rights over her (Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, 1899, pp. 62–64). Among the Todas of South India the stigma of immorality seems rather to attach to the man who grudges his wife to another; the *kashtvainol*, or grudging people, Rivers tells us, constitute one group who find it difficult to reach the next world after death (*The Todas*, 1906, p. 530).

Let us consider briefly the ethical standards obtaining among certain primitive peoples who have been carefully studied, beginning with the simplest form of society.

The *Andaman Islanders* of the Bay of Bengal live in small local groups without organized polity; but in every community some man pre-eminent in skill in hunting and warfare, wisdom and kindliness, takes the lead, holding such position only in virtue of these qualities. Respect for senior, capable, kindly men is one great factor conducing to social cohesion. A man only becomes an independent member of the community on marriage, which is not an established fact until the birth of a child. The hardest work of the community falls on the young unmarried men, and any game they kill is regarded as common property; he who

continues a celibate after the proper age for marriage is described as 'a very bad man'—an opinion revealing a social standard of morality. On the other hand, murder, assault, theft, or destruction of property is regarded simply as a personal offence for which vengeance may be taken on the culprit. But if a member of one community kill or injure the member of another, the whole community must take the matter up and avenge itself. Persistent celibacy, failure in respect towards elders, marital unfaithfulness, and laziness are regarded as wrong (which is equivalent to anti-social), but there is no punishment for such shortcomings other than loss of esteem. Promiscuous intercourse between the sexes is customary before marriage. (The above account is based on the observations of Mr. A. R. Brown, whose book on the Andaman Islanders will appear shortly.)

The *Torres Straits Islanders* had a system of morality based on the obligations of social life and deriving no sanction or support from religion; individual morality had scarcely emerged, for there was no idea of personal responsibility to any higher power outside the community. The rudiments of this sense are perhaps traceable in their attitude towards the spirits of the departed among the Eastern Islanders. Ghosts, if stinted in the matter of funeral ceremonies, might feel resentment and cause strong winds to destroy their relatives' houses or gardens; or their displeasure might be aroused because their children were neglected or wronged, or their property taken by those who had no claim to it. No doubt in the past such fear of the ghost's wrath had a deterrent effect on wrongdoers, and helped to keep the people in the straight path of virtue (*Torres Straits Reports*, vol. vi. [1908], p. 127). These islanders were very carefully studied by the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition in 1898; they are rapidly becoming modified by the influence of missionaries and traders, and are borrowing the moral concepts of higher cultures. A definite system of morals was inculcated when lads were initiated into manhood, and there is no ground for suspecting any missionary influence in the statements made by the natives. The following is the code *in extenso* of the Western Islanders as related in jargon English :—

We tell you and you think every year and every day. What word we speak out, you must put it along your heart.

You think for yourself, you're no stone or firewood, you're a man just like me.

You no play with small play-canoe, or with toy-spear; that all finish now. You no play with boy and girl now; you a man now and no boy.

If any man meets you walking along the road and you are carrying sweet-potatoes, or coco-nuts, or other food, you offer it to him without his having to ask you for some; he will then call you a good boy, but if you do not he will call you a bad boy.

Look here! Suppose a man send you for anything, you must do it quick—you no too much run about. Tell you do something, you do it quick. You should carry things for old men.

When all men stay at the *kwod* (ceremonial ground) you no walk upright, you stoop down as you walk. Do not stand upright in the presence of the old men. You must not speak to the men in the *kwod*.

You must not touch anything belonging to another man. S'pose you take anything and you lose it, he will call you a bad boy. You must ask him first, then if you lose it the man will say, 'Oh! it's my fault, I gave it to you.'

You no steal. You no take thing belong man without leave. If you see a fish-spear and take it, s'pose you break it and you no got spear, how you pay man? S'pose you see a dugong-harpoon in a canoe and take it and man he no savvy, then you lose it or break it, how you pay him? You no got dugong-harpoon.

You must take cold heart (*i.e.* you must have a quiet temper).

You must not talk scandal (*i.e.* if he heard about any one committing adultery he was to remain silent and not talk about it, and so make it worse) nor swear.

You no go and talk a lie, you speak straight. When you want to speak some word, you speak true, no tell lie; to tell lies no good.

You work hard to get plenty fish, and dugong, and turtle. You make garden, then you full up of food.

S'pose man ask you for food or water or anything else, you give him half of what you got. If you do, you good boy; if you do not, no one like you.

S'pose you're a bad boy, by and by you dead quick—sorcery man kill you—same too s'pose you speak too much or you play in *kwod*.

Give food to sorcerer should he want any.

S'pose you got plenty fish, you give mother and father before you give to brother; if you have a wife, give her a little, and plenty to parents, for they have had hard work along of you.

Look after mother and father; never mind if you and your wife have to go without. Give half of all your fish to your parents; don't be mean.

Don't speak bad word to mother. Father and mother all along same as food in belly; when they die you feel hungry and empty.

Mind your uncles too and cousins.

S'pose a man talk bad to your brother, you help him, you talk too.

If your brother is going out to fight, you help him; don't let him go first, but go together.

You no like girl first; if you do, girl laugh at you and call

you a woman (*i.e.* the young man must not propose marriage to a girl, but must wait for her to speak first).

You no marry your cousin, she all same sister.

You no marry sister of your mate, or by and by you will be ashamed; mates all same brothers (but mates, *i.e.* two close friends, may like brothers marry two sisters).

If a woman walk alone, you no follow; by and by man look, he call you bad name.

If a canoe is going out to fight another place, you go in canoe; no stop behind to steal women.

The injunctions were: remembrance of admonitions, reticence, thoughtfulness, respectful behaviour, prompt obedience, generosity, diligence, kindness to parents and other relatives in deed and word, truthfulness, helpfulness, manliness, discretion in dealing with women, quiet temper. Bravery, ferocity, endurance of pain and hardship, and other warlike qualities, were regarded as great virtues. The prohibitions were against theft, borrowing without leave, shirking duty, talkativeness, abusive language, talking scandal, marriage with certain individuals, revealing the sacred secrets.

The Eastern Islanders gave sound moral and practical instruction to youths at initiation. In their case the social welfare depended upon horticulture, and this fact is reflected in certain precepts of the code. A youth must not spend his days on the reef catching fish and neglect his garden; he might go on the reef once a week or so. He was strictly enjoined to make a good and large garden, and was taught the best method: *e.g.* 'When you got *ketai* (a kind of climbing yam), you plant him along big tree, you keep him along tree for three or four years.' He was told to build a large house for himself and surround it with a fence. There were admonitions against stealing other men's garden stuff or wives, against loss of temper, talking scandal, and so on, and death was threatened to any who should divulge secrets of the Malu cult to a woman or an uninitiated man.

The above precepts represent the regular course of instruction, but in individual cases an unruly youth might be reprimanded, as is shown by the following hypothetical instance given by two Western Islanders. If the eldest son of a family were bad-tempered, quarrelsome, and unkind in his talk, a number of men would come and give him a friendly warning: 'You are the eldest brother, but you are like an unsteady pole that wobbles in a tide-way. Your youngest brother is a steady fellow and lives quietly. You had better do the same or the *maidelaig* (sorcerer) will have something to say to you; he is watching you. You must take care of yourself. We now warn you, in case you may want to amend your ways. It would be better for you to stop that bad fashion and to follow your youngest brother's example and remain quiet.'

As regards the behaviour of the people in everyday life, the men seem to have treated their wives well on the whole and to have been affectionate to them; parents were very fond of their children, and no case of cruelty was heard of. The shame felt when any tabu was broken which regulated the behaviour of certain persons to one another was a manifestation of domestic morality.

Sexual morality: the highest moral opprobrium attached to incest, *i.e.* marriage or connexion within the clan or between those considered as too nearly related. This is an example of a social convention which was of fundamental biological importance to the community. Irregular relations with women were spoken of as 'stealing,' girls being regarded as the property of their fathers, and wives as that of their husbands; the only party wronged was the owner. There seems to have been no word for fornication or adultery other than 'theft,' though this does not necessarily imply the absence of a corresponding concept. It seems that chastity before marriage was formerly practically unknown, but decorum was always observed. Unbridled licence was probably never indulged in, public opinion exercising a restraining influence. In the case of the rape of a married woman or adultery with her, the aggrieved husband might require the death of both parties, and he would take over the wives of the co-respondent if he were married, but sometimes he would satisfy himself with a fine. However, the women seem to have been faithful wives as a rule.

Commercial morality: it was customary for canoes to be purchased from New Guinea on the instalment system, and this could not have persisted unless there had been honest dealing between debtor and creditor. Repudiation of debts would have resulted in a cessation of the supply of canoes, and then 'how we get fish, or turtle, or dugong, we hungry all the time, that no good'; also there would have been fighting.

Crime: any infringement of the rules of the community was regarded as an offence against

society rather than a definite violation of law. Many acts of the people were of a social nature; a clan or group must perform certain ceremonies for their own or the public weal. Such practices were regulated by tradition, and any inaccuracy of performance on the part of an individual might impair their efficacy and would clearly constitute a crime against society. Most tabus and regulations arose in the interests of the community, though some were designed to strengthen the authority of the old men. Any infringement of custom weakened that authority and tended towards individualism and disintegration of the community, which was a danger to be guarded against. Crimes against the person would be punished by the injured party if strong enough; if not, he would enlist the help of the sorcerer or else of his friends.

Revenge: the blood-feud between different communities was a recognized custom, but private wrongs were often avenged by the community.

Homicide was not *a priori* reprehensible: a man had the right to kill his own wife or children since they were his property; and fœticide and infanticide were not uncommon, being a social necessity in view of the limited food-supply. No stigma attached to any one who sought the sorceryman's help to compass the sickness or death of an enemy. The murder of one's clansman, relative, or friend was a matter for personal revenge. To kill foreigners in fair fight or by treachery was most meritorious, and he who brought home skulls covered himself with glory and found favour with women. In the early days any stranger or person arriving unbidden was done to death—a custom arising doubtless as an act of communal self-preservation, for outside the island lay the great hostile unknown whose emissaries boded harm.

Among the *Elema tribes of the Papuan Gulf* moral instruction is given to youths when they are secluded for the initiation ceremonies. The Rev. J. Holmes states (*Jour. Anth. Inst.* xxxii. [1902], p. 418) that admonitions respecting a man's duty to his tribe have always the first place. When choosing a wife, the primary consideration is that the girl be one likely to bear healthy children who will be a strength to the tribe; if she is barren, the husband's obligation ceases. If twins are born it is right to bury one of them, because no mother can nourish two children at once successfully, and two weak men are not the credit to the tribe that one strong man can be. No one will be responsible for the future conduct of an illegitimate child; it is best, therefore, to strangle it. If a mother dies, no one can be relied on to nourish her child satisfactorily; so it is well that it die too. Much attention is devoted to the art of sorcery in order to impress on the minds of the initiates how great is the power of sorcerers. Careful advice is given as to tribal duties; each individual must regard the tribal enemies as his own. The tribal conscience of the Papuan Gulf is fully attuned to Nature's law of the survival of the fittest: personal desires and all else are subordinated to the great end of adding to the strength of the tribe.

In *Kaiser Wilhelms-Land* boys undergoing the *asa* rites are taught certain moral precepts: to be generous, not to steal, to behave properly towards the women.

The *Bushongo*, a Bantu people living in the Upper Kasai basin, Southern Congo, have advanced in their social organization to the point of having a well-defined chieftainship, about which their polity centres. Their morality, as expressed in their traditional law, is based on fairly high ideas. Actions causing material harm to the community or to individuals are regarded as crimes; drunkenness is an attenuating circumstance, and held in no special disapprobation. Incest is a crime against the community, and in the few cases on record the man has always committed suicide on account of his public disgrace. Hospitality—that is, food and shelter—must be given to strangers regardless of their tribe. Fraud, lying, and bad faith are intrinsically evil deeds; cowardice is punished only by universal disapproval (Torday and Joyce, *Annales du Musée du Congo Belge*, 1911, p. 75). No mention is made of any religious sanction attaching to the code of morals of the Bushongo. The all-powerful creator, Chembe, since leaving this world, seems to have concerned himself very little with the human race, except for an occasional appearance to some individual in a dream: no actual cult is paid to him (*op. cit.* p. 120). Among the Western Bushongo, youths undergo initiation at which they are taught the law (*nkanda*) as follows:—

1. Above all men is the Chief: absolute obedience is due to him; his person and possessions are to be respected; there is one chief only, the Nyimi; none other must be obeyed.
2. Obedience and respect are due to the chief's descendants.

3. Respect the nakedness of your mother; look not upon her while she is bathing; when going to your parents' home, do not enter suddenly; say who you are, and wait till you are invited within, lest you enter at an inopportune moment.
4. Respect and obedience are due to parents from their children.
5. If you take in a temporary mistress, arrange it so that your parents see nothing.
6. Do not use indecent language before your parents (*e.g.* when going aside into the bush for purposes of nature, invent an excuse).
7. If your father's loin-cloth is displaced so that you see his buttocks, tell him; if your mother is in like case say nothing, it is her daughter who should tell her of it and not her son. You must not make your mother blush.
8. Respect the body of your parents; ask your friends to dress them for burial, for fear of your seeing them naked; do not perform this duty yourself.
9. Do not look at a woman while she is lying in.
10. Do not undress a woman in public.
11. Do not beat your wife; but if married people quarrel, do not interfere.
12. Be just to your enemy; if he is in danger of drowning, rescue him; if he is attacked, go to his aid; if the chief sends for him, do not refrain from giving the message in the hope that he may be punished.
13. Do not allow several persons to attack one.
14. In warfare avoid killing, but defend yourself with courage.
15. Do not steal: if you want a thing, ask the owner for it; if he refuses, do without it.
16. Be faithful to your wife while she is with child.
17. Respect the wives of the following persons: the king, the king's sons, your friends, your slaves, your sons, your father, your uncles, your brothers, your cousins; also respect your female cousins and your cousins' daughters.
18. Do not waste your substance in gaming.
19. Do not lie to a man of your own tribe (*op. cit.* pp. 85–86).

These prohibitions are called *Ikina Nyimi*, royal prohibitions, and are distinct from the *Ikina Bari*, tabus on animals, which seem to be a degenerate form of totemism.

The *Todas*, living on the jungle-surrounded plateau of the Nilgiri Hills in South India, have a code of morality presenting many points of interest. Their whole life centres in the care of their sacred cattle and the work of the dairy, from which women are rigidly excluded. Rivers (*The Todas*, 1906, p. 554) doubts whether crime can be said to exist among them. 'Acts such as infanticide are committed . . . but since these are the outcome of custom they are not crimes from the Toda point of view.' They have a code of offences against the dairy (p. 295), but these must be regarded as sins rather than crimes, since the civil authority, the *naim*, takes no account of them; they are punished directly by the gods, and various ceremonies of an expiatory character take place. The list of offences includes quarrelling between people of the same clan at a festival, quarrelling in the dairy, stealing milk, butter, or ghi from the dairy; but these are regarded as sins of sacrilege against the dairy, not as crimes against the persons concerned. Rivers heard of no offence against property in any other connexion; ornaments and clothing are apparently never stolen. Cases of assault or murder seem unheard of; the only instance of murder on record is that described in the legend of Kwoten. 'The Todas may take part in the murder of a Kurumba who has been working magic, but this is of course no crime from the Toda point of view, but an obvious method of self-defence, for it is believed that the only way of stopping Kurumba sorcery is to kill the sorcerer' (p. 555). Suicide by strangling is said to have been a recognized custom among the Todas. As regards sexual intercourse, there is little restriction of any kind; several Todas assured Rivers that unfaithfulness was no motive for divorce, being in no way regarded as wrong; there seems to be no word in the Toda language for adultery. From the point of view of the savage, Toda sexual morality is certainly very low; the custom of polyandry seems to have weakened the idea of the husband's proprietary rights in the wife to a very great extent. Even the abhorrence of incest, which is almost universal, seems absent in the case of the Todas. It may fairly be said that the whole communal conscience is concentrated on the dairy, the ordinary relations of life being of subsidiary importance.

The inculcation of morality.—The folk-tales of backward peoples the world over cannot be considered to offer any ethical teaching; not that the sentiments expressed in them are immoral—they are simply non-moral. Some may relate how misfortune followed wrongdoing, but as a rule actions regarded by the people themselves as offences are recorded without comment (cf. *Torres Straits Reports*, vol. v. p. 273). The example of the older men serves as incentive to good behaviour—that is to say, to conduct in accordance with the accepted standard. The initiation ceremonies, however, afford the supreme occasion for moral instruction.

These rites are of the deepest significance: they represent the new birth to the responsibilities of manhood, the putting away of childhood once and for all. At the psychological moment in his physical and mental development, when his young virility is surging within him, a boy is taken apart into the bush with his fellow-initiates, separated entirely from the wonted environment, restricted by tabus on certain foods, and compelled to undergo tests of endurance and to witnesss ceremonies which fill him with awe and it may be alarm. It is during this momentous period in a boy's life that all instruction in tribal lore is imparted and he learns what it behoves a man to do. The time of seclusion may last for months and in a few instances for years. Some initiatory rites are pantomimic representations of what novices must avoid in future, and have at first sight a highly immoral appearance: for instance, at the initiation ceremonies of the Coast Murring of S.E. Australia, the *kabos* (instructors) made use of an inverted manner of speaking, saying one thing when another was intended, their object being to break the boys of a habit of telling lies and to make them for the future truth-telling (A. W. Howitt, *Nat. Tribes of S.E. Australia*, p. 533). Various moral offences are represented, and the novices are threatened with death or violence if they repeat such actions. Obscene gestures are made on these occasions by some tribes, but their purpose is to shock the initiates, and any sign of levity is suppressed instantly by a blow. As regards phallic observances met with among the Australians and elsewhere, Professor Hutton Webster points out (*Primitive Secret Societies*, 1908, p. 50, n. 2) that they are to be interpreted from this primitive point of view of instruction and warning. 'But, remembering that the initiation ceremonies are intended primarily as a preparation for marriage, we shall not be surprised to find much instruction in sexual matters, conveyed sometimes in a most direct and startling fashion.' Among many tribes the whole education of youths is compressed into this short period. They are taught the complicated class and totemic divisions on which the marriage system is based, the tribal songs, dances, games, and traditions. When the initiation ceremonies are over, Kurnai boys (Victoria) remain for months in the bush, gaining their own living and learning self-control, manly duties, and such virtues as to obey the old men, to live peaceably with their friends and share all they have with them, to avoid interfering with girls and married women, and to observe the food restrictions.

In Africa, too, the initiation of youths and often of girls at puberty is very widespread, and instruction of various kinds is imparted during their seclusion. Basuto boys are beaten frequently and mercilessly. They are told to mend their ways, to quit themselves like men, fear theft and adultery, honour their parents, and obey their chiefs. Bechuana lads receive much the same treatment. At the close of initiation a long exhortation is delivered. All objects connected with their seclusion are burnt, and they may never again visit the scene of seclusion, where they have left all evil dispositions and follies of childhood. Professor Hutton Webster, from whom quotations have been made above, has an admirable chapter on 'The Training of the Novice' (*op. cit.* ch. iv.), in which many additional instances are cited. 'Obedience to the elders or tribal chiefs, bravery in battle, liberality towards the community, independence of maternal control, steadfast attachment to the traditional customs and the established moral code, are social virtues of great importance in rude communities.'

It would be easy to multiply instances of ethical codes and of initiation ceremonies at which these are inculcated, but it is unnecessary to do so. The social morality of the Torres Straits Islanders has been dealt with at considerable length, because it seems desirable to give an approximately complete view of the moral concepts of a particular people and of the effects of these upon them. In the majority of other cases such information is fragmentary, though doubtless more rigorous investigation would reveal similar conditions. The object of this article has been to point out the futility of applying the moral standards of higher civilizations to the conduct of primitive peoples, and the impossibility of justly appreciating the social relations and ideals of a people without taking into account their environment and mode of life.

In the Study.

Recent History and Historical Questions.

The Eastern Roman Empire.

A CURIOUS change has passed over the writing of history. Once upon a time the historian paid as much regard to the manner of his writing as to the matter of it. Now all endeavour is given to the discovery of the truth; the historians of most repute make nothing of its presentation. Gibbon, Macaulay, Froude—you can tell that a torn-off page is theirs; but it takes all the insight of an accomplished scholar to distinguish Trevelyan from Taylor, or Oman from Bury.

So we are not to expect the fascination of a distinguished English style in the reading of Professor Bury's new volume. It gives us *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire* from the fall of Irene to the accession of Basil I., that is, the period of sixty-five years from 802 A.D. to 867 A.D. (Macmillan; 12s. net). It is thus a direct continuation, but on a larger scale, of the same author's *History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene*. Dr. Bury calls the period the Amorian epoch, from the birthplace (Amorion) of Michael II. It is not an epoch that has greatly attracted the historian, whether mediæval or modern. For that very reason it attracts Professor Bury. And for the double reason it attracts us. For if we do not look for distinction of style, we know that we shall obtain a picture of this neglected period as nearly accurate and reliable as the present state of knowledge will allow it to be made.

Now there is one strong reason why we should desire to be made familiar with the facts. This was the period in which the hundred and twenty years' struggle over images in churches came to an end. Dr. Bury tells the story in his own matter-of-fact manner. And it is, perhaps, some explanation of his manner that it is a satisfaction to him to be able to say of the conclusion that it was a compromise. The icons were restored, and the iconoclasts were pronounced heretic: but henceforth only pictures appear in churches, sculpture is excluded. The word *icon* takes on a new and narrower meaning.

Professor Bury is much troubled with the difficulty of distinguishing truth from fiction. He lays down the principle at the very beginning of his book that the incredible is not necessarily untrue. And so throughout the book he sifts the most absurd stories with serious face, and keeps the grain of reality he believes to be in them. And when he can find no grain of reality, he still records the story on the plea that 'it may have a certain value for the history of culture.'

Pitt and Napoleon.

Dr. Holland Rose is the biographer of both Pitt and Napoleon. And now he has gathered together some chips from his biographical workshop and offered them under the title of *Pitt and Napoleon, Essays and Letters* (Bell; 10s. 6d. net).

Books of this kind are usually made up of rejected chapters, chapters deservedly rejected. Dr. Rose's essays are as valuable as any chapter in his *Pitt* or his *Napoleon*. They are written for the discussion of points of dispute or entanglement. They are therefore necessary to a complete knowledge of the career of his heroes. And it does not much matter whether they are read before the biographies or after.

There is, for example, a discussion of the true significance of Trafalgar. Nelson believed that the destruction of Napoleon's fleet would mean the destruction of Napoleon. That was not so. But the victory of Trafalgar compelled Napoleon to abandon every method of humbling England but one, that is, to isolate her from the trade of the Continent and so reduce her in time to submission. The plan was not statesmanlike so much as inevitable, and it ended in the ruin of Napoleon himself.

In another essay Dr. Rose explains the victory of Waterloo. It was due to Napoleon's impervious confidence in himself. Like the Pharisee of the parable, he was self-righteous and despised others. Among the rest he despised Wellington. There is in this volume the record of an interview between Napoleon and Major I. H. Vivian in Elba. The question was put direct to Napoleon, Did he think Wellington a great general? He answered shortly, Yes. Major Vivian pressed it. The only answer was a sharper Yes, yes.

The letters which the volume contains are now published for the first time. They belong to the life of Pitt.

Education.

It is by experiment that we obtain our knowledge in education as in other things. And truly we are experimenting at present. The sorrow is that we have to make our experiments on boys and girls. No consideration, however, daunts the educational theorist. Here is Mr. J. Howard Moore coolly telling us that our present methods in education are radically, aye and criminally, wrong. We inform our children about the stars and omit all knowledge of their own bodies. We do worse. We cram them with physical facts and neglect the weightier matters of life and conduct. It is all true. We must reform. Mr. Howard Moore in his book on *Ethics and Education* (Bell; 3s. net) writes quite convincingly. However we may dislike changes, we must recognize that a change is necessary here. And the sooner we make it the better.

Bede.

There are excellent editions of some of Bede's works in the original. Dr. Charles Plummer may almost be said to owe his fame to his edition. But until now there has been no really reliable translation. The translation of Giles was a considerable improvement upon that of Stevens, but it was far from perfect. Moreover, it was issued so long ago as 1842, and a revision of it has long been due. That—so far as the Ecclesiastical History is concerned—has been undertaken and most satisfactorily accomplished by A. M. Sellar, formerly Vice-Principal of Lady Margaret College, Oxford. The title is *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of England* (Bell & Sons; 5s.). The revision has been carried out with the aid of all the important work done on Bede during the last half-century, and also, as we are informed in the preface, with the assistance of living Bede scholars. The translation is furnished with short footnotes. These notes, the editor tells us, are not intended to compete with Plummer's notes, but to present in a short and convenient form the substance of the views held by trustworthy authorities on matters that are obscure or in dispute.

Historical Biography.

Fighters and Martyrs for the Freedom of Faith is the title of a bulky book in close type which contains biographical sketches of Wyclif, Savonarola, Luther, Tindale, Knox, Barrowe, Robinson, Cromwell, Milton, Fox, Bunyan, Watts, Wesley, Carey, Williams, and Livingstone. The writer of the book is the Rev. Luke S. Walmsley; the publishers are Messrs. James Clarke & Co. (3s. 6d. net). It is a book that ought to have come out at Christmas, but it will keep till the Christmas following, and then it will be one of the best of gifts for aspiring boy or hero-worshipping girl.

Jerusalem in History.

In the long list of the 'Mediæval Town' series issued by Messrs. Dent, no volume could have been harder to compress within the limits while retaining the necessary interest than the volume on Jerusalem. *The Story of Jerusalem* (4s. 6d. net), written by Col. Sir C. M. Watson, and illustrated by Geneviève Watson, covers the whole long history of the most wonderful city in the world, records many an incident in detail, and carries the reader on, absorbed and delighted, to the last page. Sir Charles Watson was the inevitable choice for this volume. We doubt if there is another Englishman who knows the whole history of Jerusalem so intimately.

Biblical History.

Professor Foakes Jackson has adapted his *Biblical History of the Hebrews* for the use of students who are beginning the serious study of the Old Testament. The title of the new book, for it is as good as new, is *A Biblical History for Junior Forms* (Cambridge: Heffer; 2s. 6d.).

Independency.

Faith, Freedom, and the Future is a fine alliteration. And it is more. It is the title of a new book by the Rev. P. T. Forsyth, D.D., Principal of Hackney College, a book of history, the history of Independency, but of which the subject is really Authority, that subject which most urgently demands cautious and well-informed consideration. It is the title of a book in which the alternative 'Authority or Subjectivity' is seriously and thoroughly considered by one who loves liberty of spirit so much that he is most anxious it should not be used as a primrose path to licence of the

flesh. In other words, Dr. Forsyth recognizes, and recognizes gladly, that the old idea of Authority as an external imposition is gone; but greatly fears that it is likely to be replaced by an authority that is yet more capricious and more tyrannical, the authority of every man's own opinion. And how does he hope to prevent that? By showing that history is against it. He traces the history of the ideas of Authority and Independence throughout the experience of the Church, beginning at the Reformation. As a historical exercise it is delightful. But all the way there are also very pleasant excursions to places, both in Scripture and out of it, where the Word of God has made itself a presence and a power. It is the power of that presence that constitutes Authority, that and that alone.

The book is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (5s.).

Race-Power.

The Torch is the title of a volume, first published in 1905, which contains eight lectures on 'Race-Power in Literature,' delivered before the Lowell Institute of Boston by Mr. George Edward Woodberry (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). The thesis of the book is this. Mankind in the process of civilization stores up race-power, in one form or another, so that it is a continually growing fund. Literature, pre-eminently, is such a store of spiritual race-power, derived originally from the historical life or from the general experience of men, and transformed by imagination so that all which is not necessary falls away from it and what is left is truth in its simplest, most vivid and vital form. Mythology, chivalry, and the Scriptures are three such sifted deposits of the past. After setting forth his thesis, Mr. Woodberry illustrates it by means of the Titan myth, and then applies it to the works of Spenser, Milton, Wordsworth, and Shelley. He shows, or tries to show, that 'the essential greatness and value of these poets are due to the degree in which they availed themselves of the race-store.' The greatest poets 'have always been the best scholars of their time, not in the encyclopædic sense that they knew everything, but in the sense that they possessed the living knowledge of their age, so far as it concerns the human soul and its history.'

Mediæval Canon Law.

In a very recent deliverance setting forth the legal case for Disendowment, Mr. Ellis J. Griffith, K.C., M.P., leader of the Welsh Liberal members in the House of Commons, lays down the position as follows:—

'Modern historical research, since the date of the discussion on the question in the House of Commons in connexion with the Welsh Disestablishment Bill of 1895, has completely shattered the theory of continuity put forward by the late Professor Freeman and Lord Selbourne. Professor Maitland, in his work on the *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, has advanced arguments to establish the absolute identity'—will the reader please note?—'of the ecclesiastical legal system of the pre-Reformation Church of England with that of the contemporary Church of Rome, which the controversialists on your side have never attempted to answer.'

That can no longer be said. For in a volume entitled *The Canon Law in Mediæval England* (Murray; 6s. net), the Rev. Arthur Ogle, M.A., Rector of Otham, Maidstone, attempts to answer Maitland. He writes his book for that sole purpose. He denies that Maitland's authority is 'so decisive as it has become the fashion to assert.' And thus, though disclaiming any political intention, but claiming to be a historian pure and simple, he endeavours to show that there is 'neither moral nor legal right in favour of the disendowment of the Church in Wales.'

England's Industrial Development.

However they may vote, it is certain that the vast majority of British electors are neither convinced Tariff Reformers nor confirmed Free Traders. They still want to know. It is for that great multitude that Mr. Arthur D. Innes has written a historical survey of commerce and industry, and published it under the title of *England's Industrial Development* (Rivingtons; 5s. net). 'My purpose,' says Mr. Innes, 'has been to treat the whole subject simply as a historian, without identifying myself with any economic school; without any intention of supplementing the armoury of the devotees of Richard Cobden or the disciples of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the advocates of Social Democracy or the champions of Indi-

vidualism. I have made it my aim to state facts so far as they are ascertainable, and to give an intelligible explanation of the principles which rightly or wrongly have guided economic action.' The volume has something of the appearance of the school book, and it does possess the school book's simplicity and accuracy. But while the son may get it up for an examination, the father may read it on the railway.

Virginibus Puerisque.

This is the most momentous and it may be the most memorable year in cricket ever known in England, and it is no surprise to find that the children's preacher is turning the event to account. The Rev. James Learmount has issued a volume of 'Fifty-two Fresh-air Talks to Young Folk,' giving it the title of *God's Out of Doors* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.). Here is one of the 'talks.'

Guard Well Your Wickets.

A German officer not long ago said that British people, wherever they go, early set up two things —first of all a church, and next a cricket ground. And surely that is a right thing to do, to try to look after the whole man. The two things are not incompatible, and some of the happiest days I have ever known have been spent with a cricket club which I started in connexion with my church. But no one to-day argues that religion must have nothing to do with cricket or with recreation. The cricket field, at all events, is a recognized training-ground for the battle of life.

The Australians are here. The summer sun is pouring out his glory The two things go together—cricket and sunshine.

The great thing this year is, of course, the 'test' matches. Will England win or lose the 'rubber'? The term 'test' is most suggestive in common life. There are some who say that the test matches of life are not played on gala days when everything is smooth and the sun is shining. They are played, we are told, in the stern battle for bread every day in hard times. That is largely true; but I fancy that the real test match of life is fought under cricket conditions. When the weather is fine and the road smooth, and the sun shines, and all goes well, that is apt to be more fatal to a man's real life than the hard battle. It is a hard test when you ask a man to be good and earnest when all is going well, and money is plentiful, and health is good. A man often has his wicket knocked out then, who, when the pitch is sticky, and the ground heavy, and the wind cold, would keep up his wicket. He would be all attention under hard circumstances; he would feel that then he must be at his best. A man needs to be great friends with the Captain of his salvation when all is going swimmingly.

The player in life's great test matches is there as a pupil of the Captain. We are told to-day that a certain player is a replica of another player; he has been the pupil of a certain great player, and has reproduced the style of his master. That is the idea in the game of life. Christ, our Captain, gives His life to His followers, and men must see that life cropping out everywhere in them as really as men see the style of one cricketer produced in another. Men do not say of the player I have in my mind that he is a mere copy of his master, but that he has become his master; he has not only copied, but the very spirit of the teacher has entered into him, and the same strokes, the same freedom and ability, are shown by him. The ability of both is recognized, and they are generally sent in to take the 'first knock' in the games. They are able, as a rule, to wear down the bowling. That is the idea for the Christian life.

Cricket as played in our county teams is a tremendous strain upon the players. I saw it asserted not long ago that cricketers of this type are short-lived. At first sight the conditions of cricket appear to be entirely in favour of the players—fresh air and sunshine are theirs in large measure. But there is great mental and nervous strain involved. The well-known cricketer is, it is said, a serious-looking person. Often his livelihood is at stake. The innings is awaited with apprehension if a man has any nerves at all.

A breakdown in batting means awful mortification of spirit. The bowler is often at the mercy of the batsman in fine weather and on good wickets, and *vice versa*. Fielding is perhaps the greatest strain of all upon the nerves. All are anxious to do well, and the thousands of keen eyes of the spectators, and often their hisses and hootings if a ball is missed, are very trying. British crowds are the fairest in the world, but even in Britain we know something about 'horse-play.'

We cannot too often remember that no one is more sorry than the man who drops a catch or lets a ball get past him, and a hostile demonstration is not calculated to brace his nerves for the next chance.

If you look at the hands of some of our cricketers, you would be surprised to see how by constantly gripping the bat and straining the hands when catching swift balls, all the fingers are curiously shaped and deformed. Cricket is a keen game, and demands the strained attention and the hearty, fearless action of the whole man. It is every bit as hard and trying as the battle of life; it is only because it is a game that it is not felt to be so.

The fact of the matter is, first-class cricket is really too serious, there is not enough of the 'festival' order about it, and many people think that some slow cricketers deserve 'barracking' when they resort to stone-walling, late starts, and tea intervals. The game tends to ruin through averages and statistics and county championship tables. All these things encourage men to play for their own hands, and the glorification of a century by the papers, even if it has been made at funereal pace, earns too much glory. One glorious hour of Jessop's scientific slogging is more to be desired than many days of tedious and ignoble play. One 'sticker' is enough for any team. What happiness and exhilaration Jessop, Tyldesley, Lord Dalmeny, or A. E. Lawton have given to thousands of people by their skill, daring, and pluck in their seemingly easy display of 'fireworks.' If cricket is to live, there must be more venture, more go, more aggressiveness on the part of the players. If men in business hugged their opportunities to make money as some players hug their bats and keep on stone-walling, bankruptcy would be the certain end. We want less abnormally cautious play, and cricket will continue to be our great British game in spite of its great winter rival—football. Less of the coldly-calculating spirit, mathematical formula and rules visible to the naked eye of the onlooker, Mr. Cricketer, and we will all like you better and encourage you more. As Mr. Knight puts it, 'Alertness and elasticity of mind no less than of body are the very life of cricket. Without them we get either slackness or boredom.'

Let none of us run down cricket and its crowds. It is infinitely better that men should be out in the sunshine watching cricket, with all its beautiful exhibitions of skill and endurance, than that they should be engaged in card-playing, or domino-playing, or fuddling in a public-house. Cricket is a fine counter attraction to degrading pleasures, and a fine relaxation after a week's monotonous work amidst the perpetual motion of machinery.

Let me give you some words to remember when at cricket—they are taken from the book *On Playing the Game*, by the Rev. Samuel Marriot: 'Guard well your wickets, viz. Truth, Honour, Purity. The batsmen who score well and are reliable, being always near the top of the averages, are recognized by their self-knowledge, self-reverence, and self-control. Dr. Grace says the duty of a batsman is to make runs, so attend diligently to your "scoring sheet," which is your character. Play well, and "funk" nothing. . . . And in the Great Test Match of Life may you have a glorious innings, and Heaven's ovation on entering the Great Pavilion.'

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London.

II.

(1) The Creeds tried from the standpoint of personal faith as the Christian of to-day exercises it are disappointing both as regards what is included and what is excluded. The Apostles' Creed is expressly an individual confession; and the Athanasian Creed declares that 'Whosoever would be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith except any one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.' The Nicene and Chalcedonian symbols are bishops' creeds, rather than laymen's, and are a declaration of the common

faith of the Church as defined to condemn heresy and exclude heretics. The Apostles' Creed is historical, reciting the facts past, present, and future about Jesus Christ, which the Christian believer must assert over-against the denial of heresy. The third article dealing with the virgin-birth, apart altogether from any critical questions which may be raised about the fact, is one to which the personal faith of many Christians to-day attaches no significance. The descent to the lower world has probably quite fallen out of the effective belief of the modern Christian. And if the belief in the Second Coming is still held, it does not exercise the influence over the Christian life which it had in the Apostolic Age. To me it seems that each of these articles does point to an essential element in Christian truth, the absolute sinlessness of Jesus, the complete efficacy of His sacrifice for the salvation of all the generations of men, whatever be the way that the divine grace is brought within the reach of all, and the final triumph of Christ as the consummation of the present order of human history. But we cannot to-day express these truths just as did the generation of believers who confessed their faith in the Apostle's Creed. The doctrines of the trinity, the divinity and the humanity of Christ, the unity of the person, are all distinctive contents of Christian thought; but it cannot surely be maintained that the exact, elaborate metaphysical formulation of these doctrines in the Athanasian Creed can claim permanent and universal authority for Christian faith. Be the metaphysics good or bad, faith lives and works in another region than that of metaphysical abstractions.

(2) The dominant interest of the Nicene symbol is not merely the divinity of Jesus Christ, but, over-against the inadequate Arian representation of that divinity, the divinity as *oneness in substance* of the Son with the Father. In the third section of this article the suitability of the metaphysical formulæ employed will be discussed. Meanwhile from the standpoint of personal faith it may be contended that, however expressed, the truth that God Himself and no other was in Christ saving mankind is essential. The sufficiency and the finality of the Christian salvation is assured only if the work was not accomplished by any creature, but by the Creator Himself as man for man. A vital interest of the Christian religion was at stake in this controversy.

(3) The reality of the manhood of Jesus Christ is an essential truth for Christian faith; but so is the unity of the person of Christ. (i.) The Christian thinker of to-day would treat more tolerantly and even appreciatively the attempt of Apollinaris to make that unity more real than the orthodox doctrine did. His psychology is not ours to-day; we do not distinguish a rational and an animal soul as he did; and our conception of personality allows of an immanence of God as personal in man, which does not suppress the human personality or destroy the unity of the personal experience and character. For us, therefore, the assertion of 'a rational soul' in Christ has lost much of its significance. (ii.) In discussing the metaphysical formulæ of the Chalcedonian symbol, we shall consider the question whether Nestorius was really guilty of the heresy for which he was condemned. At the present stage of our discussion all we are concerned to show is that Christian faith does demand the personal unity of Christ; and that in asserting that unity in opposition to its alleged denial this Creed was safeguarding a vital interest. It must be added, however, that the Creed did nothing to make that unity more concretely real, and so more intelligible to the mind, but rather in its underlying assumption of an essential opposition of divine and human nature, and of the absolute impassibility and immobility of the divine nature, implicitly excluded even the possibility of any such unity. Nestorianism was more logical, given the common assumption, than the Creed. The four 'famous adverbs' employed to describe the distinction of the natures in the unity of the person posit rather than resolve the problem. (iii.) Eutychianism was a greater danger to the Christian faith than Nestorianism; it would have cut off the metaphysical creed altogether from its historical basis in the actual life of Jesus on earth. And yet Eutychianism only carried to its logical conclusion the dominant tendency of the Christian thought of that age. Athanasius spoke of a ἕνωσις φυσική. The term θεοτόκος applied to Mary the mother of Jesus, which Cyril so vehemently defended against Nestorius, indicates that in the current conception the divinity absorbed the humanity. Many of the Fathers present the same conception. The Creed of Chalcedon did render an invaluable service in insisting, as it did, that the human nature was real, complete, unabsorbed into the divine. An inadequate conception of person-

ality in God and man made the framers of the symbol incapable of thinking the personal unity of both God and man in Christ. It is in the very factors which the creeds ignore in the earthly life of Jesus that the solution of the problem lies; in His moral character and religious consciousness, His revealing truth and redeeming grace we can discover divine-human personality. It is these moral and religious facts which the creeds pass over on which personal faith to-day lays hold, and to which it closely clings. Both negatively and positively the creeds fail to meet the demand of personal faith.

Literature.

PRINCIPAL SIMON.

The Rev. Frederick J. Powicke, Ph.D., has written the biography of the late Principal Simon of the United College, Bradford. The title is *David Worthington Simon* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.). It cannot have been an easy thing to do, for Dr. Simon lived a life of the utmost simplicity and quietness. His strength was in his character; but character is the most difficult thing on earth to turn into language. Character, however, has influence; and what Dr. Powicke has done is to gather together the men who came under the influence of Dr. Simon's character and get them to tell what he was to them. These tributes are certainly not all the book. Dr. Powicke himself has written a considerable part of it, and there are many letters, for Dr. Simon was a delightful letter-writer. But the tributes of friends and students are an important element in it. We cannot think of any recent biography in which that element bulks so largely or produces so memorable an impression.

Dr. Massie was Dr. Simon's colleague at Spring Hill College for fifteen years—up to the time of Dr. Simon's appointment to the Principalship of the Theological Hall in Edinburgh. After speaking of the inspiration of saintliness in his character, Dr. Massie says: 'With all this he was a man, and, in the best sense, a natural man: if he had been otherwise he would have belied himself. His nature abhorred cant, that is, according to Hazlitt's definition, not hypocrisy, the pretending to feel what you don't feel at all—that is out of the reckoning—but what truly religious men are often guilty of, overwrought presentation of a feeling which at its root is genuine. "Treacle," as he used often to call it, made him sick, and even inclined him, as he extravagantly put it, to profanity. A luscious spiritual phraseology, or what he termed "slush," provoked him (in my company, at any rate) to an unrestrained mockery which bubbled out of a keen sense of humour and which would undoubtedly have made a matter-of-fact piety stand with its bristles erect and its mouth wide open. Like our common friend Dale, he shrank from, as unmanly, such ways of speaking of our Lord and Master and Judge as "Dear Jesus," "Sweet Jesus." The truth was that he saw how sentimentality tended to kill true reverence, and to nourish a mawkish and (not womanly but) womanish attitude towards the Son of Man. And that was his and Dale's criticism of the Faber style of hymnology.'

THE MAFULU.

The Mafulu are a mountain people in British New Guinea. They have had a Roman Catholic Mission among them for five years. They have also seen an occasional trader or scientific investigator. But they are really in as uncivilized a state as it is possible now to find a race in any part of the world. And that was the very attraction which drew Mr. Robert W. Williamson to visit them in the year 1910. He went not out of mere curiosity, but out of a desire to increase our knowledge of the mind and manners of the untutored savage; and he went well furnished with those questions which Dr. Frazer has been the chief instrument in preparing for the use of anthropological inquirers. He confesses that the natives did not understand his questions, and when they did, often refused to answer them. And he is very fair in enabling us to distinguish between information and inference. The book which he has written, and to which he has given the simple title of *The Mafulu* (Macmillan; 14s. net), is plentifully illustrated from photographs, many of which were supplied by the Roman Catholic missionaries, who did everything

in their power for the author's personal comfort and for his book.

The book contains nothing that is absolutely new, but it supplies a good many additional examples of this custom and that superstition, confirming some theories and discrediting others. Apart, however, from the actual information which it furnishes, it is a pleasant book to read, unusually pleasant even for a book of exploration, so easy is the writer's narrative and so manifest his sincerity.

On the question of dress, that extremely difficult and sometimes delicate question, Mr. Williamson evidently inclines to the opinion that it has nothing whatever to do with the relation of the sexes. Its origin is not in the feeling of shame, nor is its use due to any emotion of modesty. It is a surprise to find that infant betrothal is common among a people who have so little ceremony and so little regard for the ties of marriage. Mr. Williamson mentions one case, of which he knew for a fact, in which a girl of fifteen or sixteen years of age was betrothed to the unborn son of a chief, and the price of the betrothal actually paid. When the boy was born (how did they know it would be a boy?) and died in infancy, the girl was henceforth regarded as a widow. Sentimental people will be pleased to learn that a young man speaks of his sweetheart as his *ojande*, which means his flower. When a boy wants to marry, and does not know where to seek a wife, he sometimes lights a fire in the bush and then goes off in the direction in which the wind blows the flame. In the first village he arrives at he seeks and usually finds his wife.

INDIVIDUALITY AND VALUE.

The Gifford Lectures in Edinburgh University for 1911 were delivered by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, LL.D., D.C.L. They are now published by Messrs. Macmillan under the title of *The Principle of Individuality and Value* (10s. net).

It may be said sweepingly that Mr. Bosanquet's Gifford Lectures were delivered for the purpose of telling us what philosophy has done for us. He believes that there is a good deal of rubbish still uttered in the name of philosophy, but that it can be got rid of. When it is got rid of, and the sooner it is got rid of the better, certain things which were once theory can be claimed as fact. It is our business to claim them as fact, to stand confidently upon them, and from that firm footing to go forward.

Is it possible, then, to say shortly what these philosophical facts are? They can be expressed in a single word. That word is Individuality. Of course Individuality is a large word. It is to be defined in opposition to some things and in conformity with others, and it may be said, though again somewhat sweepingly, that Mr. Bosanquet's Gifford Lectures are there to tell us what is meant by Individuality.

There are moments when the lecturer seems to say that Individuality is simply a synonym for Spirituality. But if he said that, he would be most careful to point out that Spirituality is not the annihilation of the 'outward,' but its transfiguration in the total life. There are other moments when he seems to allow Individuality to be swallowed up in the idea of the Absolute. But again he is careful to maintain that while we may and must be included in the Absolute, which is greater than ourselves, we nevertheless are ourselves and in the Absolute both gain and retain our Individuality. For with Mr. Bernard Bosanquet the Absolute is not altogether distinguishable from God, a God who may be known, reverenced and loved. But the distinction between the Absolute and God, if there is any, is to be the subject of the second course of lectures, the course for 1912.

SCHAFF-HERZOG.

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have published the last volume of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (21s. net). It is the thickest volume of the twelve, containing nearly 600 pages, for it not only completes the alphabet, but runs over it all again, and fills in the omissions that have occurred in any of the volumes. These omissions are given in an Appendix of fifty pages.

It is interesting to observe that one of the omissions is Bergson, and another Eucken. So these men had not risen above the horizon even so recently as the issue of the early volumes of this work! But surely Mary Baker Eddy was known then, yet here she is in the Appendix. The short article on her life and work has been written by a Christian Scientist, which is certainly as it ought to be. There is also an article under the title of 'Psychotherapy and Christian Science' written from the same standpoint.

The longest article in the Appendix appears under the title 'Monophysitism and the Oriental Separated Churches.' It is signed by Dr. Ernest C. Margrander, Chancellor to the Orthodox Catholic Archbishop of America.

In the body of this volume there is an article on 'Union of the Churches.' It is divided into four parts. First there is a statement of the Anglican position by Dr. Francis J. Hall, which is followed by a note on Anglo-Swedish Negotiations. Next the Orthodox Catholic position is described by Chancellor Margrander. This is succeeded by an account of the Protestant position by Dr. Newman Smyth. The last part is occupied with a short exposition of the Roman Catholic position, written by Dr. J. F. Driscoll. The editors say that an article from the Græco-Russian standpoint was arranged for but indefinitely delayed. They add that it may appear later. A supplement by one of the editors points out that a wide union is impossible unless either the episcopally ordained are willing to include non-episcopal communions without reordination (which at present they are not), or non-episcopal ministers are willing to say that their ordinations are invalid (which again 'at present they are not'). The whole matter is resolved into that compact but inextricable deadlock.

A volume of the 'Guild Library' has been given to *Literature and Life* (A. & C. Black; 1s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Lauchlan Maclean Watt, M.A., B.D. The title is world-embracing; but Mr. Watt has a definite purpose before him in the writing of the book, which he states in this way. It 'is intended,' he says, 'to interest young men and women in the spiritual principles which underlie true Literature, and to give them a bias in the direction of these, as exhibited in the great writers. It is meant to be an incentive to wider reading, and to the deepening of acquaintance with books.' The volume is accordingly divided into two parts. The first part tells us what distinguishes literature from writing that is not literature; the second part shows us how that distinction is maintained throughout the Bible, Shakespeare, and other great books. It is the editors' object, we understand, by means of the 'Guild Library,' to make life larger and fuller all round. There could have been no hesitation, therefore, in accepting Mr. Watt's book. Moreover, there is true religion in it, more than in many books which are sprinkled more freely with the name of God.

In his *Types of English Piety* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net) the Rev. R. H. Coats, M.A., B.D., has succeeded in being both elementary and profound. And both at the same time. Not only so, but he is Johannine also in the transparent unconsciousness of his style. The impression which his book makes is that he has studied the subject of English piety for a long time, until the essential things have become very clear to his mind; and the language has been fitly chosen. Moreover, the book is a product of this present time. We are not less ardent sacerdotalists, evangelicals, or mystics than our fathers were, but we are less fiercely so. Even the sacerdotalist can see good in evangelicalism and in mysticism, and regret that he cannot attain to it. Mr. Coats is no latitudinarian; he has not hidden from us his preference in the types of piety. But he has risen sufficiently above their limitations to give us a picture of all three which will remain with us for ever. The best of the book is that we are confirmed by it in the value of our own type of piety and made more watchful than ever against its perversion.

An author's greatness depends upon what he writes, his popularity upon what is written about him. One here and there, curious and studious, read Eucken and read Bergson, and when they made their discoveries known the world applauded. Now the danger is that Eucken and Bergson may have their popularity buried under too much commentary. But that time is not yet. And Mr. E. Hermann's book, called *Eucken and Bergson: Their Significance for Christian Thought* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net), will still be serviceable. Hermann draws most unmistakably to Eucken. Bergson is not yet constructive enough for confidence. But both Eucken and Bergson are a long way from that knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ which we hope they will come to. Mr. Hermann is one of the easiest and most immediately useful, at least for the preacher, of all the commentators.

The lecturer is disappearing. Even in America, they say, where once he was able to make business men forget their luncheon hour, he is passing away. Has the magazine displaced him? Surely

an article that can be read would gain tenfold force if it were uttered. But it depends on the utterance. Many men can write, very few are the men who can speak.

Of the few Dr. S. Parkes Cadman is one. His lectures, of which he has published seven (delivered at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences in 1910) in a volume entitled *Charles Darwin and other English Thinkers* (James Clarke & Co.; 5s. net) are pleasant to read, and evidently were quite impressive to hear. They have lost a good deal in the printing, but they still retain a certain personality and quiet charm. And if we are in danger of forgetting what manner of men these were—Darwin, Huxley, Mill, Martineau, and Matthew Arnold—and what they accomplished, Dr. Cadman's lectures will recover much of it for us.

The Rev. William Souper, M.A., of Clapham, has issued an 'Introduction to Christian Thought' under the title of *Constructive Christianity* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). He believes that a fierce struggle is going on between nature and spirit for the possession of the mind of man. For some time nature has had the best of it, the advantage being gained when Darwin published his *Origin of Species*. But great thinkers have come to the aid of the spirit, and Mr. Souper would do all in his power to cheer them on. For the supremacy of nature at its highest is culture, and culture is selfishness; but the supremacy of the spirit is love. Mr. Souper in his argument finds himself very soon commending Christ. For in Christ he finds not only the example of unselfish love but also the instrument of its prevailing power in society. His book is the modern *Come and See*.

The Rev. W. Charter Piggott has published nineteen sermons, after stripping them of their texts and otherwise giving them the look of essays, and has called his book *The Imperishable Word* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). He himself tells us that they are sermons, and that he has transformed them into essays; he does not tell us why. Do essays sell better than sermons? We hope not. Mr. Piggott's sermons would have sold readily as sermons.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have sent out all at once several good books this spring, but they have issued nothing better than *Problems and Perplexities*, by the Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D., though it is the smallest of them all (2s. 6d. net). It is the smallest, but it is full of matter. Dr. Orchard fills a column or more of the *Christian Commonwealth* every week with answers to correspondents. These are the most valuable of the answers.

It is claimed by Mr. Robert Hugh Benson, who writes the preface, that a book entitled *The Mustard Tree* (Duckworth; 5s. net) introduces a new method in apologetic. The old method, he says, was to prove the divinity of Christ, and from that to deduce the infallibility of the Church. The new method is to point to the facts that are before men's eyes,—the facts, for example, of the Unity of the Church, the intense faith of Catholics in the Eucharist, the devotion to Mary,—and from these facts to work back to the Divinity. In any case, that is the method of apologetic pursued in *The Mustard Tree*, which is written by Mr. O. R. Vassall-Phillips. There is an Epilogue by Mr. Hilaire Belloc, which is a clever résumé of the whole argument which the book contains.

'One need be no specialist in sociology to discern the chief "note" of social change during the modern epoch. The main economic phenomenon of the nineteenth century was the rise of the great working class, joint product of the political and of the industrial revolution. The main fact of the twentieth century is bound to be the advance of this class into conscious power.'

Accordingly Vida D. Scudder writes a book on *Socialism and Character* (Dent; 5s. net) to guide the great working class to a right use of their power. Notice that word 'character' in the title. If that word gets its place and influence in the life of the working class, the power will not be abused. But in order that character may be formed, and may tell, it is necessary that there be some recognition of duty as well as some claim of right; it is necessary, indeed, that duty be felt as the impress of an authority which cannot be disputed. Thus the book makes the demand for an authority that can be recognized as authoritative and may be unhesitatingly obeyed. The authority of superior numbers is tyranny; it is in the end the selfish assertion of each man's own will, and there-

fore the removal of all authority. Where, then, will the universally acknowledged and universally beneficent authority be found? The answer is the one word God. 'God wills it'—when that is heard, as we now understand God, when that is obeyed, the power of the great working class will be a gift of utmost good to the world. It is an opportunity for the Christian preacher.

We have received from Mr. Francis Griffiths Parts 55 to 64 of *The Churchman's Pulpit*. These include sermons for Epiphany Sunday and for the Sundays following Epiphany as far as Quinquagesima Sunday. The part for Epiphany is a special number, and costs 5s. net; the other parts are published at 1s. 6d. net.

We have also received certain parts of a distinct work called *The Children's Pulpit*. This work is further described as 'a comprehensive library of religious and moral instruction for the use of preachers and teachers in the preparation of sermons and lessons to the young.' Beginning with the first Sunday in Advent, five parts carry us on to Christmas Day and complete the first volume. These seem to be all that are yet issued, but four parts are issued of a separate series of sermons for children. It goes under the same general title of *The Children's Pulpit*, but has a sub-title 'Boys and Girls of the Old Testament.' One of these parts is a double number, and is published at 2s. 6d. net, the rest are published at 1s. net each.

Thirdly, the first number has been published of a series entitled *The Lecture Library* (1s. 6d. net). This part contains a biography of John Wesley by Mr. G. Herbert Bloye. The purpose of this series is to provide material and assistance for those who deliver lectures or write papers. Each lecture is to be complete in itself, and is to provide 'in concise and ready fashion the most thorough, reliable, and up-to-date information on the subject to which it refers.' It will also contain a list of works for further reference.

Last of all, and most important, we have received two volumes of *The Expositor's Library*. One of the volumes contains sermons on the first sixteen Psalms, the other contains sermons on the first five chapters of St. Matthew. These two volumes are nicely bound in cloth. They contain about 450 pages, and are published at 9s. net each.

All these works are edited by one and the same editor, the Rev. John Henry Burn, B.D. Mr. Burn first made his name known as the compiler of the 'Biblical Illustrator.' It is true that that work went under the name of the Rev. J. S. Exell, but it is quite well known that the work was done by Mr. Burn. The mass of material gathered into that book is simply astounding. Yet it was only the beginning of enterprise with Mr. Burn. The amount of sermon material which he is now pouring out takes one's breath away. They may say what they will about the decay of the pulpit in power. If it consumes this vast quantity of sermon material there must be a good deal of vitality in it yet.

The *Titanic* tragedy gives unexpected force to the question which is chosen as the title of Dr Frank Ballard's new book, *Why does not God Intervene?* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It is the question which many uninstructed persons have been asking these weeks past, and some very bitterly. There is no short and easy answer. The shortest and easiest, to be in agreement with the truth, is to be found just in Dr. Ballard's book. And in that book he answers other questions of perplexed humanity—Does the mystery of Pain contradict the love of God?—What is there in God to fear?—What is it to be saved?—How does the Bible stand to-day?—Are the Churches helping the modern appreciation of the Bible?—Is there any Hereafter?—What is the Christian Doctrine of Immortality?—What are Christian Churches worth to the modern world?—What is the Revival most needed in Christendom?

Epitaphs have been gathered plentifully. Why not Dedications? If any man wants work this is an almost uncultivated corner. Among the dedications that are brief and business-like place Mr. Harold Begbie's dedication of his new book, *The Ordinary Man and the Extraordinary Thing* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is dedicated 'To my friend Percy L. Parker, Editor of the Indispensable Review, "Public Opinion."'

Mr. Begbie's new book is a corrective. Did we understand from *Broken Earthenware* and the rest that Mr. Begbie believed only in sudden conversions? He corrects our mistake. This book is written to make known his belief that 'conversion is not generally a sudden and catastrophic experience, but for most men a gradual and imperceptible process of development.' Mr.

Begbie is as serious as ever; here, however, he is less theological than usual.

The best account of Bahaism is that which has been contributed by Professor Browne of Cambridge to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. But a popular account, sufficient for most men, will be found in a small book entitled *Bahaism, the Religion of Brotherhood*, which has been written by Mr. Francis Henry Skrine, F.R.Hist.S. (Longmans; 1s. 6d.).

Messrs. Macmillan have added to their 'New Shilling Library,' Dean Farrar's *Eternal Hope*. Will the railway traveller take it off the bookstall? There is both Greek and Hebrew in it. But then there is a frank discourse of the meaning of the word 'Hell.'

There are three theories about the origin and nature of our universe which we now meet every day. There is the Materialistic hypothesis—that all things mechanically evolve and are mere combinations of matter. There is the Psychic hypothesis—that spirit, potential in matter, has been the formative principle, and will become more and more dominant. And there is the God hypothesis. And the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* has written a book for the purpose of proving that the God hypothesis is the only true one. He has given it the title of *Voluntas Dei* (Macmillan; 5s. net). In order to demonstrate to us that the God hypothesis is the only true one, so as to convince us of it, he has had to show us what the God hypothesis is. In other words, his book is written to tell us who God is, and what He has done for the world. What has He done for the world? He has created it, and He has redeemed it. And both these works are past. So that now we have to recognize that this world has come into existence through the will of God, and must therefore express the character of God; and secondly, that it has been redeemed from its own wilfulness by the will of God, and the men and women in the world must therefore recognize that the redemption is accomplished, and in great gladness of heart conform themselves thereto. In great gladness, we say. This is the subject of the last chapter. Why should we be glad? Simply because the Creator and Redeemer has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; and what He has borne we do not need to carry also.

We have hitherto had to pay so exorbitantly for a good copy of Shelley's prose works that we rejoice to know that *The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley* may now be bought in a beautiful and comfortable two-volume edition for four shillings net in cloth, or six shillings net in leather. It is an addition made by Messrs. Chatto & Windus to their 'St. Martin's Library.'

The Rev. George D. Low, M.A., of East Wemyss, may live to repent of having published a volume of sermons so early in his ministry. For what will he do for want of them when by their own power and popularity he is called to a great city charge? It must be admitted that they are not conspicuously the sermons of a young man. They are grouped as Prophetic, Evangelic, and Pauline, according as the texts are taken from the Old Testament, the Gospels, or the Epistle of St. Paul. The Prophetic are the most instructive, because there Mr. Low is able to use with most effect that historical method which has been so much to him, and in which he takes such delight. It is in the Old Testament that the historical method has won its most conspicuous triumphs. The title of the volume is *The New Heart* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net).

While others are trying to prove that the Lord is worth glorying in, or even that there is a Lord to glory in, the Rev. James Little, A.M., of Belfast, is glorying in the Lord. Under the title of *Glorying in the Lord*, he issues a volume of sermons (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net) which will be called old-fashioned by the undiscerning, but which are really in the very latest fashion and the best. For we are coming back to the certainties again. All our criticism and discussion has ended in this—we see now and know that Jesus is the Living One, that He died, and that He is alive for ever and has the keys of death and of Hades. Mr. Little appears never to have doubted it. This is the preaching that prevails.

Sir Thomas Acland has written a preface to a small book on *The True Greatness of Paul the Apostle*, by Mr. L. S. Alban Wells, M.A. (Knaresborough: Parr; 1s. net). He commends the book for two reasons: first because it is short, and next because it is unprejudiced. Both

reasons are true and good. The shortness is not superficiality, and the absence of prejudice is not absence of interest, but deliberate determination on the author's part to see for himself and say only what he sees.

The book entitled *Christian and Mohammedan* (Revell; 5s. net), by the Rev. George F. Herrick, has been written expressly for the instruction of missionaries to Muslims. Its greatest service will be to instruct them in the spirit with which they should approach the Muhammadan. But at the same time it fulfils the purpose of informing the followers of Christ everywhere of two things about Muhammadanism, its present position in the world and the fundamental differences between it and Christianity. Mr. Herrick begs the missionary to deal gently with the Muhammadan; but he warns him to give no quarter to Muhammadanism. Much of the value of the book lies in its breadth of view. This is due to the fact that the author has been able to use the answers which missionaries to Muslims sent in reply to questions addressed to them. These answers came from forty-three missionaries. They came from every corner to which the Prophet has penetrated; they came even from England, for one of the correspondents is Professor Margoliouth of Oxford.

The Rev. G. W. Bull, D.D., of the First Presbyterian Church, Scranton, Pa., dissatisfied, we suppose, with the traditional commentary, has hit upon a method of expounding Scripture which may become useful. In Dr. Bull's hands it does not yield the best results: he is too anxious to be original. His method is to take a verse at a time and give its contents in a short paragraph. He is thus able to combine the verbal commentary with the continuous exposition, and even to add a touch of exhortation when desirable. In this way he has gone over St. John's Gospel. The title of his book is *Daily Reminders from the Gospel of John* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net).

It is generally known, and it is sometimes deeply lamented, that Britain is far behind America in scientific Sunday School work. Those who wish to understand what an American Sunday School is, and what is the work that is done in it, should order a copy of *The Sunday School of To-day*, by the Rev. W. Walter Smith, M.D. (Revell: 3s. 6d. net). It contains the architect's plans for building a Sunday School, the arrangement (in grades) of the classes, the management (organization) of it, the methods of teaching and of training teachers, and a list of books on each of these subjects for fuller study.

The great problem in some churches is how to get the children to enter; in others it is what to do with them after they are in. The children's sermon is not sufficient, and it is not always satisfactory. The whole problem is discussed in a book written by the Rev. Henry Woodward Hulbert, D.D., and entitled *The Church and her Children* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). The point of view is American, and that is well. For only in America is there perfect freedom of discussion, and only there have all the phases of the problem been studied. They have been studied, and they have also been experimented with in America; so that now it is in our power, by the reading of this engaging volume, to take what is applicable and likely to work with us and leave the rest alone.

'Friendship has seven sovereign elements. They are Truth, Purity, Sympathy, Personality, Spirituality, Self-giving, and Immortality.' So says Professor Robert Wells Veach, D.D., of New York. He says further that all these elements are found in Jesus, and will at last be found in every follower of Jesus. He accordingly writes a book on *The Friendship of Jesus: The Secret of a Victorious Life* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net).

In the sad story of the sinking of the *Titanic* we are told that there came a moment when the captain of the ship called to every man to look out for himself. There is a ship called Human Life. It has many self-appointed captains who are simply saying to every man to look out for himself. One of them is Mr. Ernest Belfort Bax. Mr. Bax has gathered together a number of essays and magazine articles, and published them under the title of *Problems of Men, Mind, and Morals* (Grant Richards; 6s. net). From first to last it is an argument against the existence of authority; it is an encouragement to every man to do that which is right in his own eyes. The captain of the *Titanic* did not issue his order until, as he believed, the women and children were out of the way. Mr. Bax does not trouble about the women

or the children. He has a chapter on 'The Problem of Alcohol.' The man may drink as much as he pleases. Mr. Bax does not ask that first of all the children should be saved. This is how he deals with the argument from example. 'Preachers of this doctrine forget that to be consistent they must give it a wider application than the alcohol question. For instance, I am recovering from a broken leg, or suffering from phlebitis, varicose veins, or some other malady, for which exercise is a bad thing; my inclinations, nevertheless, are to move about and thereby injure myself. It follows, therefore, that my healthy but high-souled neighbours, those with whom I am thrown in contact, ought to forego all walking exercise in order to set an example to me not to injure myself by the same.'

He has another chapter on 'The Problem of Sex and Sentiment.' Here he says that, 'however estimable the current sexual theory of Christendom may be, mechanical monogamy must be definitely abandoned, and freedom of choice, within at least certain limits, granted as just and righteous.'

The Rev. the Hon. Edward Lyttelton, M.A., B.D., Headmaster of Eton College, has written a book for the purpose of recommending the virtue of Humility. He believes that in that virtue is found the heart and soul of true Christianity. The man who lacks humility is not a Christian; and if he is not a Christian he is a very misshapen man. But where is Humility to be found? Nowhere but in a whole-hearted belief in Christ as God, and a whole-hearted acceptance of Christ as a redeemer. The book takes the shape of a series of dialogues between B and certain others, namely, a conscientious man who is called A, a theist called C, an orthodox Christian called D, and E, who sets B and all the rest right. After a year B himself is able to 'instruct others also,' and does instruct F. The argument being ended, three discussions follow, one on the Teaching and Example of Christ, one on the Influence of Greek Philosophy, and one on some Difficulties in Prayer.

The volume is called *Character and Religion* (Robert Scott; 5s. net).

The new book which Mr. A. C. Benson has written—he calls it *The Child of the Dawn* (Smith, Elder & Co.; 7s. 6d. net)—is a book to make one think. 'Philip was one of the most beautiful of all the spirits I ever came near. His last life upon earth had been a long one, and he had been a teacher. I used to tell him that I wished I had been under him as a pupil, to which he replied, laughing, that I should have found him very uninteresting. He said to me once that the way he had always distinguished the two kinds of teachers on earth had been by whether they were always anxious to teach new books and new subjects, or went on contentedly with the old. "The pleasure," he said, "was in the teaching, in making the thought clear, in tempting the boys to find out what they knew all the time; and the oftener I taught a subject the better I liked it; it was like a big cog-wheel, with a number of little cog-wheels turning with it. But the men who were always wanting to change their subjects were the men who thought of their own intellectual interest first, and very little of the small interests revolving upon it." The charm of Philip was the charm of extreme ingenuousness combined with daring insight. He never seemed to be shocked or distressed by anything. He said one day, "It was not the sensual or the timid or the ill-tempered boys who used to make me anxious. Those were definite faults and brought definite punishment; it was the hard-hearted, virtuous, ambitious, sensible boys, who were good-humoured and respectable and selfish, who bothered me; one wanted to shake them as a terrier shakes a rat—but there was nothing to get hold of. They were a credit to themselves and to their parents and to the school; and yet they went downhill with every success.'

We cannot dismiss that as untrue or even exaggerated, however we may be disturbed by it; and it is the theme of the book. The great evil in the life of men, says Mr. Benson, is to be in a position of influence or authority so that they censure others. Our minds leap immediately to the Pharisees. For, once in the history of the world the man in authority did censure so unmercifully as to make himself a by-word for ever; and we see that the Pharisee himself suffered more than his victims. This is Mr. Benson's argument. The worst evil is not the evil that is done to others by the censorious; it is the evil that is done by the censorious to themselves. Never before was the spirit of the Pharisees treated so gently as it is in this book. Never before was the calamity of it so appallingly revealed.

Mrs. A. J. Penny was a student of Böhme for about forty years of her life, and an expositor of the same for at least thirty years. She wrote no books but many magazine articles. Now these articles, contributed either to 'Light' or to 'Light and Life,' together with one article contributed to the 'New Church Independent' of Chicago, have been republished in volume form under the title of *Studies in Jacob Böhme* (Watkins; 6s. net). They make a large and handsome octavo, for there are nine-and-thirty of them, and some are of considerable length.

The resolution to issue Mrs. Penny's articles in this way was wisely taken. There are few expositors of Böhme, almost shamefully few, and even if they had been ten times as numerous as they are, Mrs. Penny would have taken a place among them. So few are they that the editor of this work can name for the use of the student only the article by Mr. G. W. Allen in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, some papers by the same author in the *Seeker*, and Dr. Whyte's monograph entitled *Jacob Behmen, an Appreciation.*

Does the preacher who has not yet discovered Böhme doubt of his practical worth? Let him read the chapter in this book on 'The Doctrine of Vicarious Suffering.'

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

The Characters.

In this part Christiana and Mercy recede somewhat into the background. Mercy finds the Valley of Humiliation congenial, and Christiana shows a fine sympathy with Mr. Fearing, which includes the confession, so true to human nature, that 'she had thought nobody was like her.' That short sentence sums up many volumes of doleful Christian experience. The loneliness of depression is one of its worst elements. Escape from sin comes when we realize that we are only bearing the common lot.

The boys sustain their parts. Matthew has much humility to learn, and much pertness to unlearn. Samuel is a boy who thinks out things, slow but sure. James is irresponsible and old-fashioned and lovable as ever, with his 'No fears, no grace'—a phrase which reminds us absurdly of James' royal namesake and his 'No bishop, no king.'

Honest is a splendid piece of portraiture. He is Old Honest, or Father Honest, representative of the bed-rock virtues. It is a vivid scene in which we meet him first, asleep beneath an oak (surely the very tree for Honest to shelter under!), with his clothes and his staff and his girdle all befitting pilgrimage. He is suspicious and defiant at the first awaking, and has no polite address for unknown folk. Had they been enemies he would have fought as long as breath was in him. And his view of the issue is simple—'he would have won, for a Christian is invincible.'

There is a touch of real genius in his disclaiming the name of 'Honesty' and claiming not to be Honesty in the abstract but only Honest in the particular; and there is a touch of far more than genius in his being reluctant to tell his name, but confessing that his town had been Stupidity. 'Stupidity is a worse place than Destruction itself; further off from the sun,' says he. And in this we find another of those instances of far insight which are so frequent in John Bunyan. Just as uneducated Mercy is dangerous, as we have seen, so uneducated Honesty is clownish, and indeed further from salvation than the less consistent and more impressionable City of Destruction. There is a word here for the wise regarding present-day reversals of old moral ideals. Certain popular novelists and playwrights are for ever canonizing Honesty as the one all-covering and all-atoning virtue. It would seem that so long as a man will but truly speak out what is in his mind, it does not matter how dangerous or

even brutal a thing it may happen to be. If Bunyan were speaking of such honesty he could not find a more clever description of it than just this, 'It lieth about four leagues beyond the City of Destruction.'

Honesty, however, has the stuff in him of the best kind of manhood. We find him certainly one of the most suggestive and interesting of all our characters. His longer speeches, indeed, tend to platitude, but his descriptions of Fearing and Self-will are most vital pieces of literature. He is a plain blunt man with little or no imagination, but, as he tells us, experience of many kinds of men. He goes straight to the point, and most of what he says is memorable.

Mr. Fearing.

Mr. Fearing is known to us only by the account given of him by Honest. The main point about him at first sight is that he is 'troublesome.' It is a world in which we all need our courage, and every timid man who will not face his troubles without revealing his fears is an unwarrantable nuisance to other pilgrims. The type of timidity which Mr. Fearing stands for is a peculiarly interesting one. He is endowed with a singular amount of physical and moral courage, but almost destitute of what we may call spiritual courage. He made no stick at the Hill Difficulty, nor did he fear the lions. He went down the Valley of Humiliation so well that it was evident there was sympathy between that Valley and him. He would lie down and kiss the flowers there and be up by break of day for it. In Vanity Fair he would have fought with everybody, so that even Great-heart confesses that he was afraid they would all have been knocked upon the head. On the Enchanted Ground he was wakeful, and indeed in such matters as these he seems to have outdone even the champion in courage. On the other hand, he was in a state of chronic terror about himself and his spiritual condition and final salvation. He lay roaring at the Slough of Despond for long, and Bunyan, playing with the idea of the allegory, knows that he had a Slough of Despond in his own mind. He stood long at the gate of Good-will seeing other people go in but feeling himself unworthy, and at last Good-will had to step out for him if he were to get in at all. Similarly he lay outside the Interpreter's door with water in his eyes, until Great-heart saw him from a window and had hard work to entreat him to enter. When he saw three men hanged by the wayside he immediately thought that he would be hanged in course of time. Similarly, at the House Beautiful, though the nights were long and cold, he was got in almost before he was willing. In the Valley of the Shadow of Death, although things were specially quiet there, yet he was continually crying out that the hobgoblins would have him. Finally, when he came to the River, he was sure that he would be 'drowned for ever,' and it almost surprises us that he managed to end with the brief words, 'I shall, I shall.' Such natures are particularly trying to strong and courageous people. We have all our own dangers to face and our constant risks to run, and it is apt to irritate us when we see a fellow-pilgrim subjective and self-conscious, as if it mattered more what happened to himself than to all the other pilgrims on the road. In all epidemics there are certain people who cannot realize the widespread misery for the nervous presentiment of their own probable illness and death. Such people are not only poor company, loving to be alone, but they are very provoking. If it be pled that after all they are the worst sufferers, from their unfortunate disposition, one is very much tempted to reply, that they deserve all they get. Nobody is of so much importance as to justify this kind of pusillanimity.

In view of all this there is nothing so striking in the whole allegory as the tenderness with which this troublesome and disagreeable character is treated. Great-heart's tenderness with him is one of Bunyan's finest passages, and the quiet humour that runs through it all only reveals more plainly the great sympathy and gentleness within. Great-heart, indeed, can very well bear with such a troublesome one, for he is well accustomed to them. The Lord at the Interpreter's House carries it very lovingly towards Fearing, and gives him many tit-bits, 'for my master, you must know, is one of very tender compassion, especially to them that are afraid.' The Lord had quieted the Shadow of Death specially for him, and had actually held in check the hobgoblins of which he was in such terror. The explanation must be that, in this particular instance, spiritual cowardice springs from a very great tenderness about sin, a scrupulous and burdened conscience. While

it is true that 'folly and fear are sisters twain,' yet it is also true that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and still less than Bunyan can we afford to lose any instance of a sensitive conscience, however crude and exaggerated it may be.

This is one explanation of Great-heart's kindliness to him. In the Puritan mind there was a great trust in conscience, and any man whose fear sprang from that source was congenial and honoured. But another reason for Great-heart's kindness is that, as Renan says, 'No one is so tender as the austere man.' The truly strong man knows, as no one else can know, how great the strain has been. Like the Herakles in Browning's *Balaustion's Adventure*:

> So long as men were only weak, not bad,
> He loved men.

So Great-heart passes, in one of the finest passages in the book, into a discourse about Fearing. At the worst it had been the weakness of his mind that made him liable to annoyance from the 'things that were his troublers,' and not weakness either of conscience or of spirit. The whole-hearted rashness of Fearing in Vanity Fair, while it endangered Great-heart's head, had strongly enlisted his sympathy; so in this musing he falls into that curiously exquisite passage about the music of life, and the bass as the ground of all music. It is a word to all wise optimists, and a true and memorable one. To ignore sorrow and danger is no true courage. To see the sad side of life and to realize the tremendous powers of evil and of sorrow is indeed the beginning, not only of wisdom, but of all courage worth the name.

Self-will.

Self-will is the other character discussed by Mr. Honest—the 'High Bass' contrasting with Fearing's 'Low Bass.' He was a man who never came in at the gate, and who was a law unto himself all through, caring neither for man, argument, nor example. He represents that antinomian type which has been curiously associated with pilgrimages all through time. It is notorious that in the Crusades, the vices as well as the virtues of pilgrims were let loose upon the world. One may see the same fact in the conversation of Chaucer's Canterbury Pilgrims, and at this day there is an Arab saying in regard to the Mecca Pilgrimage of the Haj: 'If a man has been to Mecca once, be careful; if he has been twice, cut him dead.' For all such people, the main thing is to be a pilgrim, not to be a good man—pilgrimage standing instead of all the other virtues. Self-will backed his opinions by Scripture, quoting freely such names as David, Solomon, and Sarah. He would have been better of a little of the Higher Criticism, had that been known in his day, to give him a sense of the development of moral conceptions, and to assure him that all Scripture is not given for our following the example of the lives recorded in it. Yet even upon the old lines it might have occurred to him that while David was a great sinner he was also a great repenter—a distinction not without a difference.

The distinction here drawn is between sins of infirmity and sins of presumption; between the child who falls down, blown over by a blast of wind, and him who wallows in the mire like a boar blinded by the power of lust. The point that he raises is this, that if you have the virtues of pilgrims you may have their vices, and they will not be accounted against you. If you are a David you may commit adultery, and so on. The immediate allusion is doubtless to the Ranters, those wild Antinomians of the seventeenth century; and the list of opinions such as, 'it is time enough to repent when you come to die,' is doubtless borrowed from them. It is a very subtle and persistent illusion and danger. The whole moral of Goethe's *Faust* is just this, that a man is safe as long as he strives against his sin, however much he commits; but that to settle down in sin and be satisfied with what Mephistopheles can give you is the final and only damnation. As to the other point which Self-will raises, it is one which recurs continually in such biographies as those of Nelson and of Wellington. It is extremely difficult, in judging others, not to allow their supreme services to the State, or their otherwise lovable character, to entirely excuse any private vices which they may have cherished. The reply is that, after all, we have little to do with the judgment of other men, but that in judging ourselves one thing must be kept absolutely clear. Vice is vice, and sin is sin, and must be judged as if it were the only quality of the life, and not in connexion with other condoning and compensating characteristics. Virtue is a

seamless robe, and to break one commandment is to break the whole of the law, to nullify the effect of character.

> What is the sorriest thing that enters Hell?
> None of the sins,—but this or that fair deed
> Which a soul's sin at length could supersede. [1]

Honest's remark about Self-will is significant. 'Why,' says Self-will, 'to do this by way of opinion, seems abundant more honest than to do it and hold contrary to it in opinion.' Here is the opposite doctrine from that of Faust justified on a plea of honesty. Honesty, in fact, has become a devilish habit of calling a spade a spade, and then asking no question as to whether you may not be digging with it your own grave or some other man's. It is not enough that it should be a spade. It is demanded that it should be a spade used for right ends. But this false honesty which prefers bluff to failure in every case, then and now has a habit of whitewashing vices and imagining that by honestly so doing it has changed them into virtues. If Mr. Fearing played upon the bass and found it the ground of all music, here is a man whose ground is the treble of the Venusberg, which is ultimately the ground of all discord.

Great-heart.

In this whole passage the hero appears in a more genial light, letting himself go freely, with a frequent gleam of good-humour and even of banter. It seems to be in the company of his own sex that he thaws and shows his more natural side. There is a great deal of subtlety in the portraiture of this character, and it is notable that while he is very much pleased with Honest's sage counsels to Matthew and the rest, he never talks like that himself. The conventional platitudes of religion were the proper thing to be pleased with, and neither Great-heart nor Bunyan enters any protest against them; but when they are free to talk their own language it is seldom conventional.

The joy that hailed Great-heart's coming, and indeed the whole passage, presents an interesting parallel to the wonderful story of Herakles in *Balaustion's Adventure*. His type of religiousness is deep, and yet broadly human; and his saying about Christian is characteristic of himself, —Christian 'was beloved of his God; and also he had a good heart of his own.' He is essentially a fighting man, who loves to look upon the 'bright face of danger' and enjoys a brisk encounter. He reminds us of Captain Good's saying in Africa, 'That a row is good at any time.' Like all true fighting men he is always on the alert, looking well to his feet. He has learned from Luther a certain braggadocio of faith, and 'is not afraid of all the Satans in Hell.' He is a sort of Oliver Cromwell as he sings, 'Until that I, Great-heart, arise, the pilgrims guide to be,' etc. He is a sort of Philip Sidney in his chivalrous fair play to Maul, when he lets him get up that he may be refreshed before he fight him again. His tenderness to all faults is most touching, as we have seen in regard to Fearing. As to Christian, he explains his failures in the Valley of Humiliation, 'but we will leave the good man, he is at rest, he also had a brave victory over his enemy; let Him that dwelleth above grant that we fare no worse, when we come to be tried, than he.'

It is as a man of experience that Great-heart impresses us most of all. There is a splash of his own blood upon him at all times. He is personally with us, and takes us into confidence about his own life. He also, like Fearing, finds the Valley of Humiliation congenial, for he has found that the only real greatness comes through Humiliation. Nor is his experience kept merely for his own ruminations, still less for boasting. It is to comfort others that he says, 'I have often gone through this Valley,' the Valley where a man has to pray and fight at the same time. As to the end, his is too simple a nature for modern subtleties about duty for duty's sake, and he frankly hopes for a reward at last.

His humanness and humility are, however, not a matter merely of disposition. Duty is the bottom rock of life for Great-heart, and even these interesting and attractive temperaments are due to a sense of it. 'It is my duty,' said he, 'to distrust my own ability,' and so on. And if, sometimes, the strain of the life tells even upon him, duty supplies the answer immediately. 'Some have also wished that the next way to their father's house were here, that they might be troubled no more with either hills or mountains to go over, but the way is the way, and there is an end.'

The Valley of Humiliation.

Before closing this section, we must revert for a moment to the 'Valley of Humiliation' with which

[1] D. G. Rossetti, *House of Life*, lxxxv.

it began. It has been supposed that this Valley was suggested by the very steep descent to Millbrook,[1] which lies a few miles to the south-west of Bedford, and with which Bunyan must have been familiar. It is only a mile or two distant from those Ampthill Heights on which the supposed House Beautiful is built, and while under certain atmospheric conditions the descent appears exceedingly ominous and gloomy, it is a singularly beautiful place of lush green grass and thick woods. The point that is emphasized here is the difference between the appearance of the Valley to different people. While Christian had found it so dreadful a place, Mr. Fearing was happier there than at any other part of the journey. In any cross section of literature the same phenomenon may be found. James Thomson and Robert Browning will sing you songs of precisely the same experiences, and one will be an Ode of Triumph, and the other the dirge of the City of Dreadful Night. The obvious explanation is the difference between the mental and moral life of the writers.

But in Great-heart's discussion of the Valley of Humiliation we are brought down to still more minute detail in the analysis of character. Mr. Fearing takes humiliation gently and rejoices in lowliness, because of his gentle and unassuming nature. Christian is essentially a proud man. Accordingly, he is much blamed for those slips which he encountered in going down from the House Beautiful to the Valley. In the First Part the slips were quite casually mentioned, but now attention is entirely fixed upon them, and we are told that he would have found nothing too hard if it had not been for them. There is indeed an amusing little touch of what might almost be called rationalism in this connexion, where we are told that the reason for the hard name which this Valley has got is that 'the common people, when they hear that some frightful thing has befallen such an one, in such a place, are of opinion that that place is haunted with some foul fiend or evil spirit; when, alas! it is for the fruit of their doing that such things do befall them there.' The Valley of Humiliation is indeed a fat land, and fine in summer-time, but Christian is in the winter of his discontent, and carries his climate within, just as Mr. Fearing carried a Slough of Despond within him. Christian is that sort of man, and in this is very different from Hopeful as well as from Fearing. His pride, together with 'Forgetful Green,' explains the whole trouble. 'It is when they forget what favours they have received, and how unworthy they are of them, that pilgrims meet with Apollyon there.' For the mind free from pride, and making no great demand or claim for itself, the Valley is a wholly delightful place of luxury and rich gifts, free from the noise and hurryings of life, and full of the sound of singing. In this fact the new Christian grace of humility vindicates itself, and, bringing a peculiar blessedness, outwits the pagan joy of pride.

[1] Cf. Foster, *Bunyan's Country*, chap. iv.

Contributions and Comments.

The Parable of the Mustard Seed.

Holtzmann, in his *Life of Jesus*, says of this parable: 'The Parable of the Mustard Seed was evidently handed down incorrectly from the first. The little mustard seed does not grow into a very large bush, nor is the mustard seed smaller than all the seeds of the earth. But the Parable of the Leaven shows clearly what the original version was. As leaven leavens a great quantity of flour, so the little mustard seed has a very sharp and pungent taste; in like manner, a short exhortation by a preacher may produce a powerful revolution in the hearer.' Holtzmann thinks the motive for the alteration is to be found in the saying of the Lord in Mt 17^{20} = Lk 7^{6}, where the mustard seed is contrasted with a mountain or a mulberry tree (συκάμινος). As far as Western ideas are concerned, a nut or an apple-pip would have served the purpose of the figure equally well.

Bruce, in his *Parabolic Teachings of Christ*, alludes to the possibility of the parable being susceptible to the application of the individual, the mustard seed being made to represent the same thing as the leaven; that is, not the in-

significant company of Christ's disciples, but the faith through which they become disciples.

Loisy thinks it is perhaps the coming of the Kingdom, not the Christian community, that is compared to the extraordinary development of the mustard, and the drift of the parable is not to insist upon the rapid extension of Christianity, which would be an argument against its authenticity, but to remove the doubt of the fulfilment of the gospel in the Kingdom to which its humble beginnings would give rise. The differences in the phrasing of the several evangelists are due, Loisy thinks, to their different points of view. Matthew sees in the Sower Jesus in the field of the world, in the mustard seed the Christian community, in the birds the converts of all nations; Mark insists on the smallness of the seed, because he thinks of the precarious state of the Kingdom in the present; Luke is thinking of the spread of the gospel among the Gentiles.

If we adopt the speculations of Dr. Abbott, as set forth in his volume, *The Corrections of St. Mark*, and his view of the faith as a grain of mustard seed, the difficulties connected with the parable will be somewhat modified. It is unfortunate that his learning and subtlety are stowed away in volumes inaccessible to those who cannot purchase expensive books and have no knowledge of Hebrew. It is a pity, too, that Loisy's Commentary on the Synoptists, so bold, so detailed, so painstaking, should remain untranslated, and in its French form so expensive. These piteous facts are the excuse for this article.

Dr. Abbott, then, says (376 of his *Diatessarica*) the words 'which a man sowed' would be, in Hebrew, 'which a man sowed *it*.' This superfluous pronoun, in the sentence 'which a man sowed *it* on his land,' only needs a single letter (the change of αὐτό to αὐτοῦ) to become 'on *his* land,' which might be interpreted as (Mt.) 'his field,' or (Lk.) 'his garden.'

Dr. Plummer notes here the characteristic domestic tone of Luke displayed in 'his garden,' which may be taken as equivalent to Israel.

Omitting some passages from Abbott which are not quite relevant to our purpose, he surmises that the meaning of Mark is: 'It shoots up (ἀναβαίνει) from the ground and (afterwards) *becomes* greater than all the herbs.' Matthew says, 'When it *has grown up* it *is* greater than the herbs.' In § 380 Abbott says: 'First, as to Mark's and Matthew's words, "greater than (all) the herbs," are we to suppose that Luke omitted them simply because they could be left out without detriment to the sense?' More probably there was some corruption or suspicion of corruption. The Hebrew words 'herbs' and 'green bough' are similar enough to be easily confused. And 'become greater than' resembles 'make great' or 'multiply.' Hence 'it becomes greater than the herbs' is easily confused with 'it maketh great, or multiplieth, its boughs.' But this, or nearly this, follows in Mark's next clause. Hence Luke might omit the 'herb clause,' or some form of it, as part of a conflation.

Again, the LXX affords instances where shady branches (R.V. 'lotus trees') and 'boughs' are rendered 'trees' or 'trunks.' On this analogy the Corrector might say that the meaning was not 'maketh great branches,' but 'maketh a great stem or trunk, like a tree'—a rendering adopted by Matthew and Luke. (The references are to Job $40^{21.22}$, Ezk $31^{12.13}$).

The parallelism between (Mk.) 'under its shadow' and (Matt. and Lk.) 'in its branches' may be illustrated by an instance of the Greek rendering of 'shadow' by 'branches' in Job $40^{21.22}$.

With regard to the 'Faith as a grain of mustard seed,' in his notes on Silanus (2851) Dr. Abbott quotes Origen (on Mt 17^{20}, *Lomm.* iii. 219) making 'faith as a grain of mustard seed' to signify its *small repute in the eyes of men.* Both here and later on (*Lomm.* iii. 323) Origen identifies it with Paul's '*all faith*,' and likens it to the fault of Abraham. He takes the meaning to be not that prayer is stronger than faith, but that 'all faith,' or 'faith in its entirety,' was needed and not possessed by the Apostles. On the other hand, Clem. Alex. *Theod.* Excerpt 993, says: 'The Saviour showed his faithful apostles that *prayer was stronger than faith* . . . saying, "Such (evils) as these are set right by prayer."'

These facts show (what is *a priori* probable) that the expression 'faith as a grain of mustard seed' caused difficulty in very early times. It would naturally be taken to mean 'a very little faith.' But Origen's conclusion seems right—though his arguments are not convincing—that it means 'a living faith.' It seems to have been paraphrased by Mark, both in 9^{29} and in $11^{22.23}$, as 'faithful and fervent' prayer.

If this interpretation be accepted, it is an argument in favour of Holtzmann's interpretation of the mustard seed of the parable. In any case, Dr. Abbott's speculations tend to relieve the original source of the word 'tree,' which is the chief difficulty. For, as Bruce (who is always ready to face a difficulty frankly) says, 'The plant at its best is only a great herb; and it can be called a tree only by a latitude in the use of words.'

The same author combats without dogmatizing the view of Greswell, which is akin to that of Holtzmann and Abbott, namely, that 'faith as a grain of mustard seed' does not mean faith as '*small* as a grain of mustard seed,' but faith as *vigorous* as its vital power. Similarly, in comparing the Kingdom to a grain of mustard seed, Jesus meant to say, 'The kingdom of heaven is now in appearance insignificant and impotent, but it has within it a Divine power, which will enable it to triumph over all hindrances, and make it ere long great and mighty.'

Against this Bruce sets the fact that in Palestine the smallness of the mustard seed was proverbial, but admits that it is possible that Christ's full thought was this: 'If ye had but faith even of the dimensions of a grain of mustard seed ye could work wonders, such is its power, even as the tiny seed has vital force sufficient to produce a plant reaching to the size of a tree.'

J. Hunter Smith.

Colwyn Bay.

The Children's Bread and the Dogs (Matt. xv. 21–28).

It is so startling at this time of day to have a theological dogma introduced to explain this difficulty, as is done by the Rev. G. E. Ford in The Expository Times for April, that it may be permissible to refer to the explanation offered in vol. xiii. pp. 189–190, and also to point out that the supposed difficulty about 'dogs' does not exist, as the word used denotes, not the despised dogs of the streets, but the little household dogs *which had a place in the home.* Jesus wants her to look upon Him, not as a physician from a foreign land passing by out of sight and ken, but as one in whose circle she herself has a place. She sees —understands—that is faith.

F. Warburton Lewis.

Aberystwyth.

Earthworms.

'In the boundless north-west of Canada,' Mr. Morrison informs us, 'there is not a single earthworm. This interesting fact I was able to verify by personal observation during a year of residence on the prairie.' Mr. Morrison has not accurately sifted *all* the soil, otherwise he would certainly have found a considerable number of earthworms in many parts of Canada—a statement I can easily substantiate. However, my reply to him is, that while there are large tracts of North America where there are no earthworms *now*, it does not by any means follow that they were always absent from these regions. There are two theories with regard to their absence: One is that the earthworms did their work so well long ago that the soil is too rich in humic acid and the like to be tolerant of them now. The other, put forward by Beddard in his recent little book, is that 'it is equally conceivable that this part of the world lost its earthworm fauna through excessive glaciation in the ice age, the forms having been driven south, and are now only gradually making their way northwards again.'

J. Thomson.

Carmyllie.

Matthew v. 20.

'Except your righteousness shall exceed *the righteousness* of the scribes and Pharisees.'

The Greek word for 'righteousness' is δικαιοσύνη, which is the equivalent of the Hebrew צֶדֶק or צְדָקָה, and no doubt צדקה, or its Aramaic equivalent צִדְקָתָא, was the word which Jesus actually used. In the time of Jesus, however, this word had largely lost its general meaning of 'righteousness,' and had become restricted to the action in which righteousness mainly manifests itself, namely, 'almsgiving,' or, in the concrete, 'alms.' This post-classical meaning of צדקה was known to the LXX translators of Deuteronomy, that is, as early as the middle of the third century B.C., for they render it by ἐλεημοσύνη at 6^{25} and 24^{13}. In the Psalms ἐλεημοσύνη is always the equivalent of צדקה—24 (23)^{5} 33 (32)^{5} 103 (102)^{6} as also in Is 1^{27} 28^{17} 59^{16}—or צדק—35 (34)^{24}. In Is 38^{18} it is the equivalent of אֱמֶת, 'truth,' as in Arabic is *ṣidḳ* (צדק). In Pr. it always stands for חֶסֶד, 'mercy,' as also in Gn 47^{29}. In Dn it answers to צְדָקָה—

$4^{27\,(24)}$—which clearly means 'almsgiving,' or to צְדָקָה—9^{16}.

In the Mishna צדקה means 'alms' (Pirḳê Abôth, v. 13). In Arabic one of the two words for 'alms' is the Hebrew צדקה transliterated, as it is also in Syriac: the other is probably the Aramaic זְכוּת, 'merit.'

Thus at the time of Jesus the Hebrew word צדקה had become narrowed in the scope of its meaning, exactly as our word 'charity' has done; and it seems clear that the words of Mt 5^{20} mean 'Except your *alms* exceed those of the scribes and Pharisees' (cf. Lk 11^{41} 12^{33}, Mk 12^{44}, Mt 19^{21}). It is also possible that Jesus may here have followed a common practice of His and used the word in both its senses at once (cf. Mt 8^{22}).

T. H. Weir.

University of Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

Dr. W. N. Clarke.

In the preface to his new book, *Why does not God Intervene?* Dr. Ballard pays an agreeable tribute to the work of the late Professor W. N. Clarke. After referring to Dr. Clarke's latest volume on *The Christian Doctrine of God*, which he speaks of as 'a work to which no greater praise can be accorded than to say that it is on a level with his former *Outline of Christian Theology*,' he adds in a footnote, 'With deepest regret I learn, as these pages are passing through the press, that this noble Christian teacher has passed from our human midst. If my poor words shall serve no other purpose than to direct others to the study of his invaluable works, as specified, I shall be sufficiently rewarded.'

A New Annual.

Annuals (in literature) are rare. To their small number must now be added *The Journal of the Manchester Oriental Society* (Manchester: At the University Press; 5s. net). It is an outcome of the scholarship and enthusiasm of the late Professor Hope W. Hogg, and five of the articles in the first number (1911) are from his pen. Fully half of the pages are occupied with discussions of the phrase 'Heart and Reins.' It is discussed by Mr. G. Elliot Smith and Mr. Alan H. Gardiner in relation to the Egyptian mummy; by Professor Hogg, Mr. M. A. Canney, and Mr. Abrahams in reference to its use in Hebrew and post-biblical Judaism; by Mr. King in relation to Babylonian divination; and by Bishop Casartelli and Professor Rhys Davids in regard to its use in Ancient Iran and in India. The annual ends with an appreciation of Professor Hogg, written in excellent taste by Professor Peake. There are some good illustrations.

A New Quarterly.

Its title is simply *Studies*. But it is further described as 'An Irish Quarterly Review of Letters, Philosophy, and Science.' It is published in Dublin by Messrs. M. H. Gill & Son (2s. 6d. net) The first number is dated 'March 1912.' In a 'Foreword' the editor tells us that the occasion of the appearance of a new quarterly review in Ireland is the new prospects for higher education opened up by recent legislation. In close co-operation with the professor's chair will go the chair of the editor. The subjects to be covered by the Review are therefore all ordinary University subjects. They are here divided into (1) General Modern Literature; (2) Celtic, Classical, and Oriental Subjects and Historical Questions; (3) Philosophy, Sociology, and Education; (4) Sciences, experimental and observational.

Notice especially the place given to Celtic subjects. In the first number the first article is Celtic, defiantly Celtic. It is a poem on 'The Theft of the Hounds of Finn.'

Recent Poetry.

Metred Playlets is the title which Mr. W. Winslow Hall, M.D., has given to his new book of poetry, which has been placed by Mr. Fifield in his 'Grey Boards' series. The contents are light comedies, very light, the first being called by the author a 'farcicle.' The object is to let the foolish ones of modern society see themselves as others see them.

The Hill of Vision is the title which Mr. James Stephens has given to a volume of great variety both of subject and of accomplishment (Maunsel; 3s. 6d. net). On the page opposite to a ridiculous affair called 'The Girl I left Behind Me,' there is found this picture of the heart that knows its own bitterness.

SHAME.

I was ashamed, I dared not lift my eyes,
I could not bear to look upon the skies;
What I had done! sure, everybody knew!
From everywhere hands pointed where I stood,
And scornful eyes were piercing through and through
The moody armour of my hardihood.

I heard their voices too, each word an asp
That buzz'd and stung me sudden as a flame:
And all the world was jolting on my name,
And now and then there came a wicked rasp
Of laughter, jarring me to deeper shame.

And then I looked, but there was no one nigh,
No eyes that stabbed like swords or glinted sly,
No laughter creaking on the silent air:
And then I found that I was all alone
Facing my soul, and next I was aware
That this mad mockery was all my own.

The Heart Hath Said. This is the title of a very thin volume of poems by the Rev. J. H. Newsham-Taylor, M.A. (Gay & Hancock; 1s. 6d. net). The themes are common, but there is an occasional unexpectedness in the turn of the thought. Take this:

THE GATES OF THE WEST.

The drifting horizon clouds that strain
On the ocean's breast,
Now gather like guards on a triumph-lane
Acclaiming their King who returns to reign,
When the great red sun rides home again
Through the Gates of the West!

So be my ending! Death's goal in sight,
Last steps caressed
By the sane dark clouds, that did once affright,
Now softly sustaining the lane of light,
When the warrior-soul shall pass one night
Through the Gates of the West!

Illustrations.

A volume is offered for the best illustration of any of the following texts in St. John's Gospel—13^{10} 13^{34} 14^{1} 14^{2} 14^{6} $14^{15\text{-}17}$ 14^{23} 14^{26} 14^{27} 15^{1} 15^{4} 16^{7} $16^{8\text{-}11}$ 16^{13} 16^{23} 17^{3} 17^{15} 17^{19} $18^{37.\ 38}$ 20^{17} $20^{19.\ 20}$ 20^{23} 20^{28} 20^{29} $21^{15\text{-}17}$ 21^{22}.

Also for the best illustration of any of the following texts—James 1^{17} 5^{16}, 1 Peter 1^{3} 1^{8} 1^{12} 2^{5} 2^{21} 2^{24} 3^{15} $3^{18\text{-}20}$ 5^{7}, 2 Peter $1^{5\text{-}7}$ 3^{13} 3^{18}, 1 John 1^{5} 1^{7} $1^{8.\ 9}$ 2^{1} 3^{1} 3^{2} 3^{3} 4^{7} 4^{8} 4^{16} 4^{18} 4^{19} 5^{4} 5^{21}, Jude $^{20\text{-}21}$.

Those who are successful may choose two volumes from the 'Great Texts' or the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or one volume from the 'International Critical Commentary' or the 'International Theological Library.' Ten volumes will be given in all.

The illustrations must be received by the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, by the end of July 1912.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Donald Grigor, Congregational Manse, Walkerburn.

Illustrations for the Great Text for July must be received by the 1st of June. The text is Ro $1^{3.\ 4}$.

The Great Text for August is 2 Ch 25^{2}—'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart'; along with 2 Ch 31^{21}—'He did it with all his heart, and prospered.' A copy of Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for September is 1 Co 4^{5}—'Wherefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God.' A copy of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for October is 1 Co 15^{58}—'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts' or of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for November is Ro 15^{13}—'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.' A copy of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or of Lewis's *Philocalia of Origen*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Under the Carey Foundation — a lectureship founded in memory of the great missionary — three lectures have now been delivered. The first was delivered by Sir Andrew Fraser, formerly Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, the second by Sir William Robertson Nicoll, and the third by Dr. John Clifford. Dr. Clifford delivered his lecture in Leicester on the 18th day of April 1912. His subject was *Comparative Religion and Missions to Non-Christian Peoples*.

It is the first time that the comparative study of Religion has been made the subject of a popular missionary lecture. At work among non-Christian peoples, the missionary himself discovered the necessity of some knowledge of this study long ago. And with that intellectual adaptability which makes a man a successful missionary, an adaptability which even St. Paul was conscious of using, he soon surpassed the home-keeping preacher of the gospel in his knowledge of the ways in which God had made Himself known in the world. But even the missionary has felt that this knowledge was almost contraband. Openly to commend the cause of foreign missions by advocating the comparative study of Religion—that was left to one who is distinguished alike by courage and outlook. And it is appropriate that the first lecture of the kind should be known as the Carey Lecture.

Dr. Clifford recalls those early days in which the comparative study of Religion was struggling for a place among the sciences. He recalls with yet more emotion the days in which it first appeared among the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ with the claim that it also could interpret the ways of God to man. 'The first flash of the new light was, as I can testify, most disturbing.' But that is all past now, he says, and forgotten as a dream, 'except by a few individuals like myself, who had the advantage of passing through it.'

Sometimes when one looks back upon a theological controversy one is astonished at the magnitude of it. Dr. Clifford is not astonished that the first entrance of the comparative study of Religion created such a disturbance. For he sees that it involved a complete revolution in theology. Not so much that it raised the question whether Christianity is the final religion, for that question, momentous as it is, was scarcely considered at the beginning. It was rather that now for the first time the theory of evolution was directly applied to Religion. Did God appear at a certain period in the history of the world, and in a certain place, and give to a small nation the only true religion, choosing that nation to be a peculiar people to Himself out of His mere good pleasure, and leaving all other nations in the darkness of what

was called 'nature'? That was the common belief. Or did He—and this was the contention of the new study—did He endow man with a religious faculty, and place him within reach of the means of gradually attaining to the true religion, leaving him to build it up slowly, through the ages, just as stage by stage it took untold ages for the formation of a bit of old red sandstone?

The disturbance was partly righteous and partly not. In so far as it sprang from pride in the religion of our own profession it was unrighteous. In so far as it was due to jealousy for Christ it was well-pleasing to God. But Christ is not really in it. The entrance of Christ into the world does not disturb the application of the theory of evolution. If that theory is true, He is simply an accelerating force in its favour. Christ does not arrest the ascent of man from the lower animals; He hastens the ascent. Nor does He interfere with the working of the religious faculty in the world, except to direct its aim, to increase its force, and to secure its gains.

Princeton Theological Seminary closed its hundredth session on the 12th day of May, and in commemoration of that event a volume of essays has been prepared by the members of the Faculty. The volume has been published by Messrs. Scribner's Sons of New York, under the title of *Biblical and Theological Studies* ($3 net).

It is a large volume, and very acceptable. An index would no doubt have made it larger, but then also much more acceptable. For without an index how are we to continue the use of so elaborate an article as that of Professor WARFIELD, 'On the Emotional Life of our Lord'? In that article Professor WARFIELD names the separate emotions which are attributed to Jesus in the Gospels—His compassion and love, His indignation and annoyance, His joy and sorrow; and he offers us much reliable material for the appreciation of our Lord's humanity. But how are we to return again to Professor WARFIELD'S conspectus of passages when, for example, our subject is Anger? And how are we to recover the page which contains an exposition of some difficult passage, or the footnote which offers a stinging criticism of some erring theologian?

The authors of the essays are well known to be men of ability and earnestness, and here they are found at their best. But perhaps the most remarkable thing about the book is the uniformity of its contents. They are uniform in attitude and in accomplishment beyond any volume of the kind which has been published, although many such volumes have been published within recent years. It is our present purpose to touch upon only one of the articles, and upon only a portion of that article. To satisfy curiosity, however, it may be well to name the authors and set down the subjects of their essays.

President PATTON has the first place with an essay on 'Theological Encyclopædia.' Then follow—'On the Emotional Life of our Lord,' by B. B. WARFIELD; 'The Child whose Name is Wonderful,' by John D. DAVIS; 'Jonathan Edwards: A Study,' by John DE WITT; 'The Supernatural,' by William Brenton GREENE, Jr.; 'The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit,' by Geerhardus Vos; 'The Aramaic of Daniel,' by Robert Dick WILSON; 'The Place of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus,' by William Park ARMSTRONG; 'Modern Spiritual Movements,' by Charles Rosenbury ERDMAN; 'Homiletics as a Theological Discipline,' by Frederick William LOETSCHER; 'Sin and Grace in the Biblical Narratives rehearsed in the Koran,' by James Oscar BOYD; 'The Finality of the Christian Religion,' by Caspar Wistar HODGE, Jr.; 'The Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas,' by Kerr Duncan MACMILLAN; 'Jesus and Paul,' by John Gresham MACHEN; 'The Transcendence of Jehovah, God of Israel,' by Oswald Thompson ALLIS.

The essay we wish to refer to is by Professor ERDMAN on 'Modern Spiritual Movements.' It is a paper that finds an appropriate place in the volume. For a volume commemorating the centenary of a theological institution will be expected to give some account of the movements in Christian life which have characterized the century of the seminary's existence. Now there is nothing that is more distinctively characteristic of nineteenth-century Christianity, when compared with the Christianity of the previous centuries, than the endeavour that has been made, by a great variety of movements, to reach something higher in Christian attainment, or to gain something deeper in Christian experience. The variety of these movements is amazing. Professor ERDMAN has had some difficulty in bringing them all within the seven characteristic divisions of holiness, peace, power for service, confidence in prayer, fellowship, knowledge, and hope.

The holiness movements claim his attention first. They are the most numerous. They are of the most intense earnestness. They are also most characteristic of the spiritual life of the nineteenth century. They range from sinless perfection on the one side to ethical revival on the other. But, however extreme on either hand, they are worthy of attention because without exception they have emphasized the Christian duty of closer conformity to the will of God.

To the perfectionists Professor ERDMAN has nothing more serious to say than that, in the words of Bunyan, 'Your conversation gives this your Mouth-profession, the lye.' They have claimed perfection; they have never shown themselves perfect. He seems to say that Christian perfection as a claim has never been taken seriously.

Yet he does not forget that this very phrase 'Christian perfection' was used by WESLEY to describe an experience which was to him real and momentous, and that it is still used by his followers with reality and moving power. But WESLEY's Christian perfection is a different thing from such perfection as that, for example, of Noyes and his followers. It is a perfection that does not exclude ignorance and error of judgment, with consequent wrong affections. 'It needs,' in WESLEY's language, 'the atoning blood for both words and actions which are, in a sense, transgressions of the perfect law.' Or, again in the language of WESLEY, and acceptably enough to all men, 'It is the perfection of which man is capable while dwelling in a corruptible body; it is loving the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind.'

Professor ERDMAN is more dissatisfied with FINNEY's theory of perfection. This theory is known by the name of 'the simplicity of moral action.' Sin and virtue, said FINNEY, cannot coexist at the same moment in the same human heart. A man is therefore wholly consecrated to Christ or he has none of His spirit. The two states may alternate. The man may be a Christian at one moment and a sinner the next; but he cannot be both at once. A sinful or imperfect Christian is therefore a psychological impossibility. If he is sinful he is not a Christian; if he is a Christian he is not a sinner.

Now, it is not to be denied that FINNEY's doctrine of perfection proved to be of great power in promoting personal holiness. For it came upon the Church at a time when its members were living lives of selfish indulgence, waiting for some mysterious, Divine impulse to deliver them. FINNEY declared the duty of moral choice, the necessity of immediate and whole-hearted acceptance of the salvation of God in Christ, and held out the promise of entire freedom from the dominion of sin. Dr. ERDMAN admits the practical power of the doctrine. All he says in disapproval is that FINNEY carried it too far.

There is a much more curious, and much more objectionable, doctrine of holiness than this, al-

though it moves on somewhat similar lines. It is the theory that regeneration consists in the creation of a new nature. This new nature constitutes the real self, and is sinless. The old nature still exists and may be the source of acts which are displeasing to God. Nevertheless the regenerated man is sinless. For this old nature is not himself. He himself is the new nature which does not sin. It is our old combination Jekyll and Hyde over again, but with this exception, that the man is accountable only for the good deeds of Dr. Jekyll.

The doctrine of Jekyll and Hyde has been attributed to the Plymouth Brethren, but it has never been more than a perversion of Plymouthism. In spite of their divisive tendencies, their occasional misinterpretation of Scripture and their fondness for controversy, Professor ERDMAN is sympathetic towards the Plymouth Brethren. They have been, he says, examples to their fellow-Christians in practical separation from the world, in loyal adherence to the doctrines of grace, and in personal holiness of life. To them, more than to any other body of Christians, the Church is indebted for the teachings and work of Mr. D. L. MOODY, who, though never identified with the Brethren, made their doctrines the substance of that message which he carried far and near with such marvellous results.

But the most conspicuous movement in favour of holiness made in the nineteenth century is that which is known as 'the Higher Life.' It is known by other names, as 'the second blessing,' 'entire sanctification,' or 'complete salvation.' But 'the Higher Life' is the choice of its own advocates, and is now usually accepted as more comprehensive and less committal. The essential teaching of the Higher Life, says Professor ERDMAN, is that absolute sinlessness may be attained by a single act of complete consecration to God.

Is that the doctrine of the Higher Life as it is preached to-day? Is it the doctrine of Keswick? Professor ERDMAN does not think so. That, he says, is an extreme position, and was soon discovered to be untenable. The doctrine now declared at Keswick is not absolute holiness but a perfection of Christian love and a relative holiness of life, which are now usually described as deliverance from known sin.

And such a message, says Dr. ERDMAN, the Church needs to-day. Such a movement, he says, it should welcome and promote. Too long has the mere mention of holiness awakened suspicion and a conscious contempt for theories of sinless perfection on the part of those who are content with practices of sinful imperfection. 'It is no new doctrine to declare that Christ came to save us from the power as well as the guilt of sin; but it comes like a divine revelation to many, who are in bondage to some particular form of evil, to be assured that they may enjoy and should expect continual victory. Every Christian is familiar with the divine command: "Be ye holy, for I am holy"; yet by what qualifications and excuses do we allow ourselves to be guilty of pride and indolence, and covetousness and censoriousness, of self-indulgence and spiritual indifference! Conscious of secret faults, yet facing our serious tasks, we need to be reminded anew that our Lord will use only clean vessels. Let us review the written pledges of divine help and divine fellowship, and "having these promises, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God."'

The Life of Robertson SMITH has at last appeared. He died in 1894, that is eighteen years ago, and the world he lived in has been moving at a great pace. But there are advantages in the delay. The Robertson SMITH case, the editors tell us, is now passing into history and it can be treated in an historical spirit. That is one advantage. And they name another. They say, 'Now that so many of the chief disputants have disappeared, the authors have been less embarrassed by the fear of wounding susceptibilities

justly entitled to respect, and have been able to treat every aspect of the great controversy fully and frankly.'

The editors are Dr. John Sutherland BLACK and the late Professor George CHRYSTAL. The title of the book is *The Life of William Robertson Smith*; the publishers are Messrs. A. & C. Black (15s. net). On the title-page are printed three Hebrew words. They are the words of Is 28^{16}. Translated into English they mean 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' We are within five pages of the end of the volume before we discover their appropriateness. There we are told that in the corner of the portrait by Sir George REID, which is reproduced in the frontispiece to this volume, SMITH, the day before it left the studio, painted with his own hand in the presence of the artist and another friend these three Hebrew words. The words, we are told, were often on his lips, and they certainly express a lifelong attitude of mind. Nothing, the editors tell us, was more striking in SMITH'S intellectual history than the slow progress he made towards emancipation as a theologian, the almost obstinate conservatism with which he clung to the forms of thought familiar to him in his youth.

William Robertson SMITH was born in the Free Church Manse of Keig, a remote Donside parish of Aberdeenshire. 'Before he was twelve,' says his father, 'we had the consolation of learning that a work of grace was wrought upon him, and in such a form that he was at length delivered from the fear of death and made partaker of a hope full of immortality. That the change wrought upon him was real, we had many satisfactory evidences—not the less satisfactory that there was no parade of piety, no sanctimoniousness, but a cheerful performance of daily duty, truthfulness in word and deed, and a conscientiousness which we could not help thinking was sometimes almost morbid.' Of this conscientiousness he gives an example. When still very young, and on the occasion of one of his serious illnesses, his old nurse came from a distance to see him and brought him a paper of sweets. His mother, who disapproved of the free use of such dainties, and generally kept the distribution of them in her own hands, permitted him to keep the whole store himself, and told him to take one when he thought he needed it. Some days after, she was surprised to see him rush into the parlour in his nightdress in great and evident distress, and on inquiring into the cause, was told that he could not go to sleep until he had confessed that he had that day helped himself to *two* of his goodies—the second one without any special necessity.

There was a fairly large family, some seven or eight in all. The two eldest boys William and George, with their sister Mary, formed a group by themselves. In process of time they went together to Aberdeen, the boys to the University, their sister to study 'music and other polite arts'; for the University of Aberdeen was not yet open to women. William was fifteen years of age and George not quite fourteen. Before the end of the fourth year's course of Arts, Mary went home to Keig to die. As the end of the fourth year approached William's health broke down. He could not enter for the honours examinations or even take his degree. But the examiners came to his room, put some *viva voce* questions, and granted him the degree. His abilities were always recognized, but he did not always receive this consideration.

George worked on. 'In Classics and Mathematics he not only gained first-class honours, but stood first in both—having made in the latter subject more than twice as many marks as the student who came next to him. This student, nevertheless, went immediately to Cambridge and gained an open scholarship, and afterwards obtained a high place as a wrangler. All unite in praising the brilliancy of the triumph, the modesty of the conqueror. It was at once a realization of past hopes and a lively earnest of future glories. The reversal of fortune was sudden, terrible, and dramatic. On the 6th of April, George left

Aberdeen with every honour his University could heap upon him. On the 11th of the same month he was seized with a vomiting of blood, and on the 27th he was dead.'

Of the three who went to Aberdeen together, only William was left. He recovered his strength, and went to Edinburgh to study Divinity at the New College, for the purpose of entering the ministry of the Free Church of Scotland. It was a disappointment to the Professor of Mathematics that he did not proceed to Cambridge and pursue that subject. He did not let it drop, however. He was appointed assistant to Professor Tait of Edinburgh, and curator of the new physical laboratory established by him; and he carried on this work along with his studies in theology. A younger sister, who went to Edinburgh with him, gives us a glimpse of him in his rooms. 'It used to be his boast,' she writes, 'that he had me so admirably trained that I never disturbed him by talking or anything of that kind. . . . We never talked except at meals; then I got leave to chatter as much as I liked, though sometimes his mind ran so on his work that I used to think he was hearing nothing. However, that was not the case; as I got an answer after a time, but sometimes so long after that I had nearly forgotten what I had said. He never nagged. If I did anything that did not please him he told me so in a few plain words, and then was done with it. If he saw me looking puzzled over my lessons he would suddenly say, "Stuck?" or, "Want a hand?" and then ran rapidly over the different points, making notes here and there on the margin of the book. One had to be very quick to take it all in, and sometimes I used to wish with an inward groan, as I used to wish at home when father was working out a sum, that he wasn't quite so clever. . . . On Sundays we always went to church together in the morning, racing along at a terrible pace, and at night we had as regularly a practice of Psalm tunes, "French" being a great favourite. . . . Sometimes young men came to be coached, and it was a standing joke that he always kept their pencils.'

The strongest force on the teaching staff of the New College was the Professor of Hebrew, the well-known A. B. DAVIDSON, and it was to the study of Hebrew that Robertson SMITH gave his strength. He had just finished his fourth session in Theology when the Professor of Hebrew in the Aberdeen College of the Free Church died, and SMITH was elected his successor. It was something of an experiment on the part of the Church, SMITH being only twenty-four years of age when he found himself the occupant of the Hebrew Chair. But it is one of the advantages of the late issue of this biography that we can now see the evident hand of God in this daring act of the Assembly. For if ever a man was raised up—raised up in the ancient Hebrew prophet sense—to give deliverance to the people of God, deliverance from the intolerable tyranny of a custom that never was a creed, but was the more intolerably tyrannical on that account—the custom of regarding the letter of Scripture as of more consequence than its spirit—that man was Robertson SMITH.

A large part of the biography is occupied with the SMITH case. It begins on page 179, and ends on page 451. It was an intricate as well as a long drawn out affair. Even Free Churchmen, even the Free Churchmen who took part in it, were in continual danger of losing themselves in its technicalities and turnings. But Dr. Sutherland BLACK has succeeded in making it intelligible, not only to Scotsmen, but even to reasonably curious Englishmen. It is a great triumph; and the triumph is all the greater that the central figure, whose biography is being written, remains central throughout, and is clearly seen to have been worthy of so high a calling. It is a great triumph, we say, that from first to last Robertson SMITH is revealed as he was, possessed with a mighty passion for truth, utterly unable to comprehend why other men were not similarly possessed, unhesitatingly accusing those of wanton wickedness who were only guilty of desperate dullness.

The case arose, as most of the world is aware,

out of the article 'Bible' which Smith contributed to the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. It was the first clear case of the application of the historical method to the study of the Book of books. In the inspiration of the Bible Smith was probably a simpler and more child-like believer than any of his accusers. But we now see that the method which he used—he did not advocate it, he simply used it, having come to the conclusion that no other method was applicable—was not merely different from the older theological method of study, but destructive of it. By the older method you take Deuteronomy as it stands and by judicious selection of texts prove your doctrine, not for a moment doubting that your text can be relied upon when once you have ascertained its meaning. That is the theological method. By the historical method you test the texts themselves. You ask where they came from, who was their author, what was their environment and their pedigree. And while you are much concerned to discover their actual meaning, you count it no part of your business to construct a theological dogma out of them, far less a complete system of theology. The men who opposed Smith honestly believed that they were fighting for their religion; they were only fighting for a method of study in which they had been brought up and which had already served its purpose.

Robertson Smith's great antagonist is usually understood to have been Principal Rainy. And it was expected that the biography would reveal Principal Rainy in a very unattractive light. It does nothing of the kind. There are no revelations of the ways of an ecclesiastical tactician that were not already made in Rainy's own Life. There is nothing said, even by Robertson Smith himself, in reproof of Rainy so severe as the saying which is quoted from Rainy's Life about his Jesuitism.

All this will be a surprise, and surely a welcome surprise, to the readers of Smith's biography. Rainy actually rises in our estimation. The act by which he put an end to the Smith case was the act of an autocrat. But there are occasions in the history of the world when only an autocratic act is applicable. The General Assembly of 1881 had met to depose Smith. Of that probably not a member of it was in doubt. Rainy certainly was in no doubt. But how was Smith to be deposed? If he was to be deposed after the Assembly had declared that his method of studying Scripture was wrong, a yoke would have been put upon the neck of the Free Church which its members would soon have found themselves unable to bear. Dr. Rainy moved a motion that Robertson Smith should simply be deposed, and by 423 votes against 245 the Assembly passed his motion.

Robertson Smith suffered. He did not suffer in pocket or in reputation; but he suffered. Of that there is no doubt. He loved the Free Church with a passion of devotion, and he counted himself cast out from its communion. But this also has come to pass through the delay in publishing the biography, that we now see how much greater Robertson Smith was by having to suffer these things. His opponents pointed out that he did not take his reverse in a chastened spirit, and they looked upon that as evidence that he deserved it. But his greatness did not depend upon the spirit in which he accepted the things that happened to him; it depended upon the magnitude of the work he had been called to do and the sincerity with which he had given himself to it.

The after life was uneventful. He was elected to a Fellowship in Christ's College, Cambridge, to the Adams Chair of Arabic, and even to the charge of the University Library. Scholars in all departments of study and in all civilized countries of the world were his correspondents. In the University itself he obtained a pre-eminence in scholarship which no one thought of disputing. It is true that these things did not satisfy him;

but the reader of this biography will not think the less of Robertson Smith for that. He had given his heart once; he had given it to that Church to which he believed God was speaking through him as clearly as He had spoken to the ancient Jewish Church through the prophets; and when the disappointment came he was not the man to stay himself upon fellowships or flattery.

Positive Theological Research in Germany.

By Dr. Paul Feine, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle-Wittenberg.

The esteemed editor of The Expository Times has, as the result of a letter which I was commissioned by some of my colleagues to send him, requested me to arrange for an account of the work of the so-called Modern Positive Theology in Germany being written for his readers. As my colleagues, whom I asked to do me this service, are at present fully occupied in other directions, I shall attempt to step into the breach myself.

There is something unsatisfactory in separating the various theological tendencies and reporting on only one part of theological research. For we must realize clearly that theological learning is a whole, a unit. The fact that different currents declare themselves within it constitutes its wealth and its progress. It is the mutual discussion of the various views and the comprehensive working out of the reasons for one or the other conception that give an impetus to theological study. To speak quite frankly, we regard it as a blessing that God has ordained that scientific theology should proceed in this way.

But the fact remains that in theological research sometimes the one and sometimes the other branch presses forward with greater energy. In German theology at the present day a remarkable swing of the pendulum is taking place, inasmuch as, on the part of positive theology in particular, important works have been completed, greater undertakings are being planned, and new and promising lines of thought have been opened up. In that fact we have undoubtedly a good reason for now giving a summary account of the work of positive theology; and all the more so because such an account will at the same time be a discussion of the results of the research of liberal or radical thinkers. On account of the close connexion between English and German theology, this movement in Germany is sure to awaken interest in England. Yet it would seem that, in the sphere of English theological research up to the present day, the works of the liberal rather than of the positive theologians have become known.

I have singled out the department of Old and New Testament Study, as well as of Systematic Theology, since to these fields the above refers in a special degree.

I.

The Old Testament.

About thirty years ago the conception of Old Testament literature and religious history held by J. Wellhausen and his followers began to gain supremacy. It was founded upon detailed critical investigations of sources, and took up, in regard to the history of religion, an evolutionary standpoint. With the fixing of the date of the Pentateuchal sources at a relatively late time, it was considered that a firm basis had been gained for the dating of the contents of these documents and for the analysis of the religious development discovered in them. But this made necessary a construction of the history of Israel differing essentially from the traditional one. The low religious notions of primitive peoples were used as the standard for judging the original form of the Israelitish religion. It was maintained that the Israelites, like all Semites, were people of the desert, and that desert races make no advance in civilization even in thousands of years. So the Patriarchs were held to be adherents of animism and fetishism. Even at the time of the Bedouin life, the foundation of religious and separate national development was laid by Moses; but there was as yet no question of real monotheism, of a moral idea of God, of any connexion between the new national religion of the people and the religions of the neighbouring races, the Babylonians and the Egyptians, or of

the theocratic laws of the Priests' Code. According to Wellhausen, the God of Israel came to be distinctly recognized after the occupation of the land of Canaan, in conflict with the Canaanite gods. David in establishing his kingdom had raised Him from being the God of a particular race to be the God of the country; but it was the prophets of the eighth century who first appeared with an entirely new religion. It was by them that ethical monotheism, 'the religion of Israel,' was created. In the legislation of the priests, following upon the time of the prophets, this faith remained authoritative, but through the development of the worship in the direction of exact legality it was soon degraded from its high position.

This general view of the history of Israel seemed to be established by a multitude of particular and detailed investigations; and by means of judicious popularization it made its way into cultured circles as the only justifiable conception. No new and original ideas came to light in connexion with it. The thoughts of the master were reproduced and the conception was more clearly worked out in detail. In two directions, however, the situation has altered in recent years: (1) Efforts have been made to bring the Old Testament and the religion of Israel into line with the ever-increasing mass of knowledge on the subject of ancient Eastern civilization, and (2) the soteriological importance of Israel is being more clearly recognized and brought forward.

1. The first-named movement is represented in a peculiar way by Hugo Winckler and Alfred Jeremias.[1] These we shall only mention briefly, as Winckler, the leader of the movement, does not really stand for theological interests. Winckler calls attention to the fact that in the time in which Abraham is usually placed, the whole of the Near East represented one unbroken circle of culture, of which Babylon was the chief and central point. Thousands of years before, it had perfected its civilization; at that time it was at its zenith; and, centuries later, the Babylonian language was still the language of diplomatic intercourse in the Near East, in Canaan and Egypt, as well as among the Hittites. The position of Israel was especially well-defined through its relations with the great powers of Assyria and Egypt, and the lesser powers of Tyre and Damascus. Winckler maintains that the historical narrative of the Old Testament must be understood in the light of the culture of the ancient East as a whole. He adds that the personal narratives are simply the form in which religious doctrine is presented, the O.T. documents being really polemical writings of a religio-political nature; and that the view of life there represented has its root in the Babylonian astral religion. But Winckler's main hypothesis is this. The image of heaven is very like that of earth. What takes place in the celestial or astral sphere is very like what takes place in the earthly. We find astral suggestions in the Book of Judges, in the narratives of the patriarchs and in the story of Joseph. The names of the three first kings of Israel, their lives and their history, are depicted according to the scheme of astral mythology—the moon = Saul, the sun = David, Venus = Solomon. Finally, according to Winckler, the prophets play an essential part in the politics of their time. Amos worked in accordance with the political spirit of Ahaz in the north, Jeremiah was a friend of the Chaldæans, and so on.

Winckler found favour with a number of theologians in his demand for an investigation into the far-reaching effects of Babylonian culture. This movement is usually called Pan-Babylonianism. On the conservative side a sympathetic reception was given to his protest against the treatment of the Old Testament from an evolutionary point of view, and especially against the way in which a cut-and-dry view of the history of civilization and religion was brought to bear on the Old Testament sources and was to be proved correct by the use of literary criticism. But an objection arose from the fact that, according to his way of thinking, a historical conception of many persons and things could never be acquired; they had to remain for ever shrouded in the midst of astral-mythological legend. Moreover, the whole conception of the Old Testament traditions as politico-polemical writings, or as polemical writings in the interest of a special monotheistic doctrine, was rejected. Jeremias, who is otherwise closely allied to Winckler, holds firmly, as against Winckler, to the historicity of many of the persons mentioned and of the narratives contained in the Old Testament, in spite of his acceptance of astral mythological motives; and in the same way he calls attention to the superiority of the Old Testament over the other documents of ancient Eastern intellectual life.

Winckler has taken much interest in the recover-

[1] Cf. *Die Theologie der Gegenwart*, vol. i. 1907, p. 11 ff.

ing of the remains of the civilization of the ancient Hittites. At the present moment he is working with other scholars at the scientific inferences to be drawn from the rich discoveries made since 1905 in Boghasköi, near Angora in Asia Minor. Then, again, our knowledge of ancient Egypt is increasing by means of thorough investigations. All the material gained in this way is made use of by most of the representatives of Old Testament scholarship for deepening our historical and theological knowledge of the Old Testament. I shall mention on the side of historical criticism, as examples, the names of H. Gunkel and H. Gressmann ; among conservative theologians, E. Sellin, who has himself conducted several excavations in Palestine, and R. Kittel, who has written an account of the value for O.T. research of all the excavations which have been made up till now.

2. It is more difficult to characterize the second of the above-mentioned movements, positive study in its narrower sense. Yet in spite of great differences in its separate representatives, certain fundamental similarities present themselves. All of them make the demand for a real scientific view of the O.T. They recognize the great importance for the religion of Israel of Oriental culture, of the intellectual currents and the history in which Israel was involved, and are ready to draw the corresponding historical conclusions for the O.T., even though these conclusions contradict the traditional view. On the other hand, however, they give greater importance and credence to the tradition contained in the O.T., and are sceptical with regard to evolutionary schemes and constructions. But their distinctive characteristic is this, —they put a different value upon the O.T. as a revelation from most of the representatives of the critical school. They see in O.T. religion the dispensation of God's redeeming will, and so establish important differences between it and the Oriental religions surrounding Israel. In the details, of course, there are manifold shades of difference. Some accept the results of literary criticism to a large extent, without sharing Wellhausen's conclusions with regard to religious history ; others combine their belief in revealed religion with sound religio-historical evolutionism ; others, again, go absolutely their own way, and belong to the above-named group only in respect of undefined hypotheses. Some of the positive scholars of the present day agree with theologians of other schools in this, that they do not regard as the chief task the division of the books of the Bible into their separate sources, the fixing of the composition of these and of the manner in which they were combined by subsequent editors, but rather the tracing back of the materials of Biblical writings to their first stages as literature ; indeed, even back to the times of oral tradition on the one hand, or oral or literary borrowing from other peoples on the other.

The battle against the historical reconstruction of the religious history of the Israelites has been successfully waged. The inaccuracy of the thesis that the Prophets of the eighth century were the first to establish ethical monotheism has been proved by exhaustive inquiries into the writings of the Prophets Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, etc., in their relation to Moses ; cf. the works of Ed. König, *Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte*, 1884 ; Robertson, *The Early Religion of Israel*, 1885, German ed. by K. von Orelli ; R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. i. 1888 ; S. Oettli, *Der Kultus bei Amos und Hosea*, 1895 ; E. Sellin, *Beiträge zur israelitischen und jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*, vol. i. 1896, p. 34 ff. ; F. Giesebrecht, *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes*, 1901. In these works it is proved over and over again, as E. König in the magazine *Die Reformation*, 1912, No. 8, p. 115 f., has lately shown, that the Prophets of the eighth century, according to their own evidence, claimed to be merely reformers. They were aware of a Divine mission which led them to urge their contemporaries to return to the religion founded long ago in the early days of Israel, and to protest against all religious and moral backsliding among smaller or larger sections of their people.

In these investigations it has not been denied that the Prophets had also to supplement and intensify the Law and to remould and thereby spiritualize the prophecies. These arguments have been adduced with such penetration and are so comprehensive that they made an impression even on the representatives of the Wellhausen School. For B. Stade in his *Alttestamentliche Theologie* (vol. i. 1905, § 105) expressed his opinion that in the view which sees in the Prophets of the eighth century a confirmation of the work of Moses there lay some grain of truth ; and P. Volz, who with regard to Messianic prophecy had formerly represented in a radical way the school of literary

criticism, offered in his work, *Mose: Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung über die Ursprünge der israelitischen Religion*, 1907, what is almost 'a vindication of Moses in the field of religious history,' a vindication which could scarcely have been written with greater enthusiasm by a representative of the Positive School. In the same way as König, Robertson, Sellin, and others, he proves from the Jahwistic and Elohistic document that in the post-Mosaic and pre-prophetic period of religion, in spite of lower tendencies which were then present, Jahweh was worshipped as a celestial divinity, as a God of individuals, and as a moral personality and guide of destiny; and from that he reasons *a posteriori* back to Moses and his work. He regards Moses as the founder of the Jahweh religion, which recognized Jahweh as the moral God of the world and already discerned the connexion between religion and morality.

But after the position of the Prophets and Moses in the history of religion had been placed in a different critical light, it was necessary to go still further back to the religion of the patriarchs. Here, again, the Wellhausen scheme has broken down. It is denied that the patriarchs were still merely on the level of polydæmonism, of ancestor-worship and fetishism, in that they worshipped holy mountains, streams, trees, and stones as the seat of Divine beings. Attention is called to the fact that, according to tradition, Abraham separated himself even from his relatives just on account of his religion, so that with Abraham a new religious force entered into history, and that this is no other than faith in the unseen God. This faith gives Abraham a unique position, and points to him as the first representative of the true religion of Israel. Besides, it is now recognized through the influence of present-day ethnological and evangelical scientific research, that the evolutionistic idea of progress from lower to higher degrees of religious culture was a mistaken *a priori*. Not only does belief in a good and supreme Divine Being appear at the beginning of religion among the ancestors of the Indogermanic race, but in races which are at a lower stage of civilization, we find, beside all their polydæmonism, high conceptions of the Godhead; in particular the presence of a belief in a supreme Divine Being, who has power over heaven and earth, has been established in the case of very different primitive peoples, as the South Australians, the Bataks in Sumatra, and various negro tribes in Africa.

A short time ago E. König published a collective work on the whole mass of problems pertaining to the O.T.: *Geschichte der Alttestamentlichen Religion*, 1912, and in it he has given a detailed and comprehensive criticism, from the standpoint of revelation, of the conception of Wellhausen and that which treats the O.T. from the evolutionary point of view of religious history. We may mention also for the introductory questions: E. Sellin, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1910, in which the judgment of the O.T. documents in favour of tradition is discussed; and for history, R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*[2]. The publication of a large commentary on the whole of the O.T., under the editorship of E. Sellin, on the same lines as Th. Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, has also been planned. The reasons for this undertaking are, according to the prospectus issued by the publishers (A. Deichert), chiefly the following: The exhaustive commentaries in circulation at present do not, with all their scientific significance, make a sufficiently vivid and direct impression on their readers of the uniqueness of the O.T. religion and its literature, of its superiority to all other ancient Eastern religions, and of its lasting and undying content in spite of all temporal development. Again, the last decade has brought forth in many of the branches of O.T. research, through the continuous and rapid opening up of the ancient East, quite new problems and perspectives; and to these more justice may be done by an absolutely new treatment of the O.T. writings than by a re-editing of the old commentaries. Procksch, Lotz, and König have undertaken to treat the Pentateuch; Wilke, Isaiah; Sellin, the Minor Prophets and Proverbs; Kittel, the Psalms. The first volumes of this commentary may be expected shortly.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ROMANS

ROMANS I. 3, 4.

Who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead.—R.V.

ST. PAUL summarily describes the contents of the Gospel, and says that it was wholly concerned with our Lord Jesus Christ and more especially with two facts about Him. The first fact was that *He was really man with a human body and a human soul*; this was due to His being a member of a particular and well-known Jewish family. 'According to the flesh,' that is, in respect of His human nature, He was 'born of the seed of David.' The second fact was that although man He was more than man, 'according to the spirit of holiness,' that is, in respect of His higher and superhuman nature, *He was declared to be the Son of God.* The phrase, 'according to the spirit of holiness,' in the second clause, corresponds to, and contrasts with, the phrase 'according to the flesh' in the first clause; and as the flesh in this passage certainly means human nature, and not, as often, the corrupt or animalized principle in human nature, so 'the spirit of holiness' means not the third person in the Godhead who sanctifies us, but the higher or divine nature of Christ, somewhat vaguely described and set over-against His human nature. For this less common use of the word 'spirit' we have a warrant in at least two other passages of the New Testament, and the resulting sense is that as our Lord was seen to be truly human by the fact of His birth in the family of David, so the true import and character of His higher nature became apparent when He rose from the dead.

I was much puzzled by this text years ago, when preparing notes for Indian divinity students, and commentaries available gave little help. A vague remark suggested proceedings in Law Courts. Here is a great case—the case of Jesus of Nazareth. He claimed to be Son of God. He was arrested and tried on this charge, and what would we not give for an official copy of the proceedings? The sentence was death, and He was executed. The appeal was to the High Court of Heaven. The human decision was reversed, the sentence of the earthly court was repealed, and He was 'determined Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead.'[1]

[1] Principal S. S. Thomas, Baptist Institute, Delhi.

I.

The Resurrection was a Proof of Christ's Divine Sonship.

The Apostle says that Christ was 'declared' to be the Son of God by the resurrection of the dead.

1. Events are for God what language is for man. They are the manner, the means whereby God reveals His mind and will. Events are the language of God written on the pages of human history, whether it be the history of a man or of a family or of a nation or of the world. Just as God's eternal power and Godhead are, according to the Apostle, clearly understood by reverent study of the book of Nature—the 'things that are made' as he calls it—so the judgments which are formed in the Divine mind on men, on families, on nations, are discoverable in the book of human history, as they are written in the language of events. But whether the characters in which His mind is thus declared are always legible by man or by all men is quite another question. Sometimes, indeed, they are written in a familiar alphabet; their meaning is so clear that all men may read it. All who believed that the world is governed by a moral God understood what was meant by the fall of Babylon, by the capture of Rome by Alaric, by the close of the career of Napoleon. Sometimes they are written in characters as wholly unintelligible to all living men as were the Egyptian hieroglyphics half a century ago, though they may be read by the higher intelligences around the throne in heaven, or they may be read hereafter on earth, for all that we know, by highly endowed souls. And in the book of history there is much written of this kind which eludes the efforts of man's inquisitive and constant gaze. But sometimes also the meaning of God's writing in events is hidden from the mass of men at first sight, but becomes plain to them when the key of its interpretation has been given them by some competent instructor, like the 'Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin,' traced on the wall of the banqueting chamber of the Eastern monarch, the sense of which was plain when a Daniel had been summoned to decipher it. Of such handwriting as this, too, history is full, but we must not

linger on it, since we have to fix our attention on one great example of it in one particular event, the resurrection of our Lord.

Now, that a striking occurrence such as the resurrection would have a special meaning or several meanings, is an obvious supposition. The strange thing would be if such an event could occur without any purpose or meaning at all; and St. Paul tells us what, in his inspired judgment, one such meaning was: it was to declare that Jesus Christ was the Son of God.

2. What was it in our Lord's case that invested His Resurrection with this declaratory force which the Apostle ascribes to it? The answer is, first of all, that the resurrection of our Lord was a verification of the proof which He had voluntarily offered of His own claim. Jesus claimed to be the Son of God. This He frankly confessed before the chief priest. For making this claim He was condemned and crucified, and His resurrection vindicates the justness of His claim. God declared Him to be the Son of God with power, by His resurrection from the dead. Peter said, 'This Jesus whom ye have crucified, God hath raised from the dead, exalted at his right hand, and hath made him both Lord and Christ.' Christ said that He had power to lay down His life and power to take it up again. This power was within Himself. Elijah raised the dead, but it was by a power without—a power that he had received from on High. Peter restored one to life, but it was through the power of Christ; but Jesus Christ had the power within Himself. He raised Lazarus, Jairus' daughter, and the son of the widow of Nain to life by His own power. It was because there was life within Himself, that He could say, 'Destroy this temple, and the third day I will build it up again'; 'I am the resurrection and the life.' What a comfort! What an assurance! Jesus Christ is declared to be the Son of God and the Saviour of man by His resurrection from the dead. Here is an absolute certainty of salvation. Here is assurance of remission of sins. Herein the children of God are justified, walk in newness of life with Him, and have their lives hid in God with Him.

3. The demonstration of Christ's Divine Sonship came '*with power*.' The resurrection did not hesitatingly suggest that our Lord might possibly be the Son of God; it amounted, when taken together with His life and character and teaching, to a demonstration irresistible and overwhelming, at least to the Apostle himself, that He was the Son of God. To the Apostle himself, because, looking at the connexion of the passage, it is scarcely open to doubt that the expression 'with power' points first of all to a personal experience. Saul of Tarsus, at that time an active young Rabbi in Jerusalem, strongly attached to the cause of the Pharisee party, was not one of the privileged company to whom our risen Redeemer showed Himself during the great forty days. As an unconverted Jew he would have looked at the person and work of Jesus through an atmosphere discoloured by false reports and by implacable controversial passions. But the vision on the way to Damascus changed all that. He who could bend into utter submission the mind and the will of His stoutest adversary, must be indeed of more than human stature, must be indeed Divine. To St. Paul the resurrection was a revelation of the divinity of the Son of God made with power. And so it has been ever since. The resurrection has been felt to be the fact which, beyond all others proclaims Christ to man as the Son of God. When Judas had gone his way, the important requisite in his successor was that he was to be a witness to the resurrection. The resurrection was the burden of all the recorded preaching of the earliest Church; the gospel it preached was the gospel of the resurrection; whether in the mouth of Peter or Stephen or Paul, it was all the same. And at this moment all who think seriously on the matter know that the resurrection is the point at which the creed which carries us to the faith of heaven is most clearly embedded in the soil of earth; most really capable of asserting a place for its Divine and living subject in the history of our race. Disprove the resurrection, and Christianity fades away into thin air as a graceful, but discredited illusion. But as a certain fact, it does its work as at the first in every honest conscience and intellect. More than any other event, it proclaims Christ to be the Son of God with power in millions of Christian souls.

He is the Son of God; but how is that to be demonstrated? You point me to the carpenter as He walks along with His bag of tools, and you say, 'That is the Son of God.' I may say, 'I believe it,' but my heart sighs, 'Oh, that it were demonstrated!' You point me to a man sitting tired out upon the well of Samaria, and you say, 'That is the Son of God.' I believe it, but my heart is still saying, 'Oh, I wish that He could be determined to be such!' I want a more powerful argument that will at once set the

matter beyond doubt. The Holy Ghost says that you have it in His resurrection from the dead. I see Him there on the cross, and, in His uttermost weakness, He bows His head and dies. It is really blood that gathers in a pool at the foot of that cross. Son of David, Thou hast died! But stand by that open grave on the third morning. Now, guards, arrest Him! What, Romans, will you allow the stone to be rolled back? Why do you not put your hand, in the name of the imperial Cæsar, upon the arm of that lone man as He comes forth from that sepulchre? Lay hold upon Him! No, those guards are as dead men upon the ground. Christ staked everything upon this—'I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again;' and He has taken it again. He has come up and out from among the dead, and the resurrection thunders forth, 'According to the flesh He is of the seed of David, but according to the spirit of holiness He is the Son of God.'[1]

II.

The Resurrection was the Triumph of Moral Character.

1. In the resurrection of Jesus Christ we see the victory of holiness. As we looked upon the cross and tried to read its lesson, the one thing that we saw there was the perfect holiness of the Sufferer. Everything else, all that goes to make up what the world calls success, was gone; worldly position, comfort, wide influence with others—all were gone. The Sufferer had none of these. What He had was a character with which His enemies could find no fault; a character of considerate forgiveness, of thoughtfulness for others, of earnest longing to do God's will, of absolute self-surrender and trust in God. These we saw, and then all ended in gloom. What a sad thing it would have been for human nature if that had been the real end, if this perfect human character had ended with failure in the grave. But, thank God, it was not the end. The Easter message means this, that whatever man may do, God will not neglect holiness. God will not suffer His Holy One to see corruption. In virtue of the spirit of holiness, Christ is risen from the dead; and God has set to His seal that it is not prosperity, not worldly success, not riches, but character and holiness that shall survive the grave.

The resurrection of Jesus was the triumph of character, and it is interesting to notice how this thought seems to have been the one which first laid hold of the disciples. As they talk of their risen Lord, it is by a title which was not common before, and which soon gave way to more majestic titles. He is for them 'the Just One'—'the Holy One.' 'Ye denied,' says St. Peter to the Jews, 'Ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you.' Jesus is spoken of in prayer to God as 'Thy Holy Child,' 'Thy Holy Servant' (R.V.). When St. Paul is converted he is told that God hath chosen him to see 'the Just One,' 'the Righteous One' (R.V.).[2]

[1] A. G. Brown.

2. The Resurrection was a triumph of character in the effect it had on the disciples.

Some of you may perhaps remember the striking scene in *Faust*, where Faust is about to commit suicide. The cup of poison is in his hand; he is moving it to his lips, when on his ears falls the sound of the Easter hymns singing the risen Christ. The sound and the recollections that it stirs recall him, and he is saved. But in that song which is put into the mouth of the disciples, the poet seems to me to have made one great mistake. He makes the disciples praise the victory of Christ, but bewail their own fortune, as left behind to suffer on earth:

Lo—He whom we buried,
Now out of his prison,
Living, exalted,
Royally risen!
He with the Creator,
God's joyance may share:
We on earth's bosom
Still suffer, still bear!
He has left us behind Him
To languish and pine:
Ah, Master, we sorrow
For the joy that is Thine.

How different is this from the language of the Gospel: 'And it came to pass that while He blessed them, He was parted from them and carried up into heaven, and they worshipped Him; and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the Temple, praising and blessing God.'[3]

All Christian peoples have had some conception of the importance of the resurrection. In one of the great cathedrals of Europe, the resurrection of Christ is celebrated by a beautiful and symbolic ceremony. Doves which have been confined in cages are brought out in front of the great towers of the cathedral, and the doors of the cages opened that the doves may emerge from them and mount up toward heaven. It is a symbol of the soul released from the cage of its confinement, and mounting up in resurrection glory to bask in the sunshine of God, and attain the very heaven where He dwells.[4]

III.

The Resurrection of Christ was the type of other Resurrections.

1. The phrase is not 'Resurrection from the dead,' but 'Resurrection of the dead' (plu.), be-

[2] W. Lock, in *Keble College Sermons*, 1877–1888, p. 89.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 90.
[4] A. T. Pierson, *The Hopes of the Gospel*, 170.

cause in Him the general hope of mankind received a first fulfilment. Others had been raised by prophets of old, and by Christ Himself, but only to die again. 'Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more.'

The resurrection of Jesus carried all other resurrections with it. It is not simply the resurrection of Jesus Christ by Himself; for, when Jesus Christ rose, He rose as the first-fruits of an innumerable company. Not only did Christ rise, but *Christ is the resurrection*; and in His resurrection His redeemed ones shall rise. Paul here takes a view right into the far distance; and when he says, 'declared to be the Son of God in power,' he does not simply say, 'by his own resurrection'; but 'declared to be so by the resurrection'; that is, by His own resurrection, first, and by the opening up of every grave hereafter. So we bow to Jesus and we worship Him as very God.

There is a great picture you will find in many galleries, of the Crucifixion of Christ. It was first a fine painting, then reduced by the art of engraving to a first-class steel plate. It represents the three crosses, the dark heavens, the rent rocks, and, in the foreground, saints moving out of their graves and walking towards the Holy City. The unfortunate thing is that the artist overlooked the statement of Matthew, who says, 'The rocks were rent, the graves were opened, and many of the bodies of the saints which slept, arose and came out of their graves *after his resurrection*.' What becomes of that picture? It is the embodiment of an error. The evangelist Matthew thinks of the rending of the rocks in connexion with the earthquake, and the exposure of the graves that were in those rocks, and then he adds in a kind of parenthesis, 'Many of the bodies of the saints which slept'—in these sepulchres that were rent asunder,—'arose and came out of their graves, after His resurrection'; we are not to think that they rose before Christ. He was the first-fruits of them that slept, and saints who rose after Him were like the first sheaf laid on the altar, 'on the morrow after the Sabbath,' as an offering unto the Lord. So Christ's resurrection is the first-fruits of ours, for it antedates and antecedes all other resurrections.[1]

2. No one can read the Epistles of St. Paul without observing that he constantly speaks of the crucifixion and the resurrection not only as events in the life of Jesus upon earth, but as spiritual transactions which take place within the Christian soul or character. He bids Christians to 'crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts thereof.' He says of himself, 'I am crucified with Christ'; and addressing his readers at Ephesus, he quotes a Christian hymn of the earliest age, 'Awake, thou that sleepest, arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' He exclaims in his Epistle to his Colossian friends, 'If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above.' It is true that this language of St. Paul is more particularly connected with the entrance of new converts into the Church of Christ by baptism. Conversion involved a crucifixion of the old corrupt nature, and then, as the new convert was dipped beneath the baptismal waters and raised again by the minister of the sacraments, he was, in St. Paul's words, 'Buried with Christ in baptism, and raised again to newness of life.'

But although that is the first and more usual application of the Apostle's language, his language applies also to the circumstances of the altered life of baptized Christians who have fallen from God and from grace, and need to return to God by a fresh conversion. If the body of Christ could rise only once from the grave, the Christian soul may certainly need to rise a second time; may, after a fall from grace, need such a resurrection unless all is to be lost. And when such an event in the moral or spiritual world takes place, it is strange if they who look on do not learn from it something that they had not known before about the Son of God. When a man hears the voice of the Son of God, when his eyes are open to behold His justice and His love, when he opens his ears to His warnings and His promises, when he opens his mouth to pray and to praise Him as the Author, the Redeemer, the Sanctifier of his life, when such an one exchanges his corruption for purity, his coldness for the glow of warm affections, bursts the bondages of habit and passes forth through the barriers that would fain detain him, into light and freedom; when men around behold this, and note further how in such a soul, risen and beautified, love has taken the place of hatred, joy of sullen discontent, peace of restlessness, and long-suffering of an impatience with others and with God that knew no bounds, and faith of a distrust alike of man and of God, and temperance of a perfect chaos of insurgent passions—when they see the man who dwelt yesterday among the graves, sitting to-day among the pure, clothed and in his right mind, and ask, 'Who has done it? Who has thus changed that which offers to his will a much more stubborn resistance than the dust of a buried corpse, or the stone which closes the mouth of the sepulchre?' it is clear what must be the answer—Who but He who, at the grave of

[1] A. T. Pierson, *The Hopes of the Gospel*, 169.

Bethany, announced Himself as the Resurrection and the Life, and bade Lazarus come forth from his tomb, and whose own resurrection is not merely an outward power to mould our thoughts, but an inward power to transform our very souls and characters? When the old Christians whom Saul of Tarsus had so cruelly wronged beheld his converted life, his clear intelligence, his warm affections, his true and strong will all placed at the service of the Saviour whom he but now had persecuted, what did they do? He himself shall answer: 'They glorified God in me.' And when in the Church of our day a soul rises from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, there goes forth—oh! be sure of it — into hundreds and thousands of consciences around the proclamation of the Divine power of the Son of God.[1]

In one corner of my garden there is a rubbish-heap; it is away out of sight, because it is not pleasant to look at. Yet more than once in that rubbish-heap I have seen a beautiful flower spring up and bloom; some hyacinth bulb or rose-tree root which has been thrown there by mistake will rise out of the midst of the decay into fresh and beautiful life. The true nature of bulb or root is proved by this resurrection. There could be no flower if there were no capacity for the flower. So it is with the children of the All-Father in this strange, bewildering world of ours. Despair of none: God indwells all; at the worst and darkest it is still possible for the Divine Sonship to arise in power.[2]

[1] H. P. Liddon.
[2] R. J. Campbell, *New Theology Sermons*, 42.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London.

III.

(1) When we approach the creeds from the standpoint of historical fact, we discover that they include what for some Christian scholars is doubtful, and what for the Christian scholar to-day is most certain in the historical reality of Jesus. (i.) While I myself have not found adequate reason for rejecting the tradition of the Christian Church regarding the virgin-birth, I must admit that literary and historical criticism does not allow the same degree of certainty as regards the healing and teaching ministry, the death and rising again of Christ. It is certain that a creed drawn up to-day would not demand acceptance of the fact as a necessary part of a Christian's confession of Christ as Saviour and Lord. (ii.) As regards the descent into Hades and the Second Advent, the Christian scholar could not insist on their acceptance literally as essential articles of the Christian faith, although in each the Christian thinker, even of to-day, may find a suggestion of Christian truth. (iii.) About the death of Christ by crucifixion under Pontius Pilate there is to-day no doubt or question deserving any attention from the historical student. The Resurrection is a fact which unbelief challenges to-day as in every age; but this fact is one which, on the one hand, the Christian Church must assert, and may assert on the ground of personal experience of Christ's presence and power, and of the general history of Christendom as inexplicable without the guidance and guardianship of its Living Head; and which, on the other, historical and literary criticism cannot disprove. The literature of the New Testament and the history of the Christian Church are both unintelligible if this fundamental reality is an illusion. The fact of the Resurrection of Christ has a legitimate and unavoidable claim to be included in any Christian Confession.

(2) The question may, however, be raised, whether faith should be burdened with the demand to assert historical fact at all. Is not faith concerned solely with ideas and ideals? Can faith in eternal reality rest on historical fact? The answer to the question is that the Christian religion is an historical religion with a personal founder. It is not a conception of God, man, and their mutual relation reached by speculative thought or mystical intuition; but it is a personal relation between God and man constituted in the historical reality of Jesus Christ; it is a revelation in time of the eternal God; it is a redemption in time of man unto eternal life. Idea and ideal are

not only revealed, but realized in history, God's fatherhood and man's sonship in Christ's Sonship and Saviourhood. Faith in Christ as bringing God to man, and man to God, is faith in historical fact. But this is so, not only actually but necessarily; for faith is exercised by man who lives in time, who is conditioned morally and religiously by the history of mankind; and so God must deal with him in time through history. The needs which Christ meets, the aims He fulfils in man, are facts of history. The sin to be forgiven, the sorrow to be comforted, the death to be robbed of its terror, the moral and religious good to be gained, are facts; and God deals with facts through facts. The Father Christian faith reaches in Christ is not an absentee Deity, dwelling in the eternal realm alone, but a God present in, through, and over all nature and history alike. From whatever point of view we look at Christian faith as it is actually exercised in the Christian Church, it is inseparable from historical reality. The objection to including facts in a creed falls to the ground.

(3) Have the creeds, however, included all the facts that are significant and valuable for Christian faith? While the conditions of their origin as a protection against heresy explain their incompleteness; yet what they omit deserves notice, as it will bring us face to face with the most marked contrast between the fourth and fifth centuries and the nineteenth and twentieth. The historical reality of the earthly ministry of Jesus, and the grace and truth therein manifested, are not only unmentioned in the creeds, but the Christological controversies show that the living image of Jesus was not present to Christian thought; and thus while the completeness of the humanity was asserted in abstract terms, it was not so concretely realized as to prevent an actual absorption of the humanity in the divinity. To-day, on the contrary, it is this historical reality of the earthly ministry which is the starting-point of most modern thinking, which, therefore, demands a Christology that will do full justice not to an abstract humanity, but to a concrete manhood of Jesus Christ.

The Writings of John.

IMPORTANT OVERLOOKED EVIDENCE.

By the Rev. J. Agar Beet, D.D.

In this paper, I shall adduce evidence, touching the authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Revelation, which has not yet received the attention it deserves; and especially evidence independent of authorship which goes far to prove that the distinctive teaching of the Fourth Gospel came from the lips of Christ and is supported by His divine authority. This evidence will also shed light upon the authorship of both the above books.

I.

It is needless to reproduce the abundant evidence, so ably set forth by Bishop Westcott in his invaluable commentary, published in 1880, touching the authorship and historical truth of the Fourth Gospel; and by Professor Swete for the authorship of the Book of Revelation, in another admirable commentary published in 1906. The evidence I shall adduce is the profound harmony, underlying conspicuous differences in phrase and in modes of thought, between the Fourth Gospel and the letters and addresses of St. Paul, in their presentation of the message of Christ, in contrast to His teaching as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.

Our earliest and surest evidence touching the actual teaching of Christ is to be found in the four undisputed letters of St. Paul; and especially in that to the Romans, as being an orderly statement, to men whom he had never seen, of the gospel of Christ as understood by the greatest of the Apostles.

The writer begins it by announcing himself as a 'servant of Christ,' to whom he pays homage as the Son of David and of God; and then expresses his eagerness to go to Rome, there to reap a harvest of blessing and to discharge an obligation, by preaching the gospel. This last, he then describes as 'a power of God, for salvation, to every one who

believes'; adding as an explanation that in it a righteousness of God is revealed from faith, for faith, in harmony with an ancient prophecy, 'The righteous man by faith will live.' We notice at once the emphatic repetition (in all, four times) of the cognate words *believe* and *faith*.

In v.[18], all this passes from view; while in chs. 1^{18}–3^{20} both Greeks and Jews are brought guilty and silent before the bar of a righteous God. From this shadow we emerge in ch. 3^{21} as suddenly as in ch. 1^{18} we entered it; and so doing we find again, somewhat amplified, the phraseology and teaching of ch. 1^{17}, 'a righteousness of God through faith . . . for all who believe.' This conspicuous prominence of *faith* or *believing*, as a condition of salvation, is kept before us in vv.[26. 28. 30], and is still further emphasized by the careful exposition (ch. 4) of Abraham's *faith*, which St. Paul tells us was recorded centuries before his time for the sake of those who in his day should *believe* in Him who raised Christ, and whose *faith* would be reckoned to them, as was Abraham's, for righteousness.

This salvation is further described in chs. 5–8, and culminates, in ch. 8^{31-39}, in a song of triumph. In ch. 9 St. Paul looks at it in the light of God's dealings with the patriarchs and with Israel; and sums up the result by saying, in vv.[30-32], that 'Gentiles have obtained righteousness, the righteousness which comes from *faith*,' but that Israel had not attained it, because they sought it 'not from *faith* but as from works.' Same thought in chs. $10^{4. 6. 9. 10. 11. 14}$ $11^{20. 23}$.

The same doctrine is equally conspicuous in the Epistle to the Galatians; and again and again amid the various topics discussed in St. Paul's other letters, *e.g.* Eph $1^{13. 19}$ 2^{8} 3^{17}. It also finds conspicuous expression in Christ's commission as recorded in Ac 26^{18}: 'to whom I send thee . . . in order that they may obtain pardon of sins and a lot among the sanctified, by *faith* in me.' Similarly, Ac $13^{38. 39}$, doubtless a pattern of St. Paul's preaching: 'Through this man pardon of sins is announced to you . . . in him every one who *believes* is justified.' Nothing in the history of human thought is more certain than that Salvation by Faith was the kernel and marrow of the gospel preached by the great apostle who founded the Churches of Europe.

Passing now to the Synoptic Gospels, we are at once conscious of a great change. In beautiful language, the Sermon on the Mount sets before us a new morality, the Law of the Kingdom of Christ; and in Mt 11^{28} we hear the welcome call, 'Come to me, all who are weary and burdened, and I will give you rest.' In ch. 8^{10} and elsewhere, we have *faith* followed by blessing. But the nearest approach to salvation for every one who believes is found in a sort of supplement to the Second Gospel, ch. 16^{16}, 'He who *believes* and is baptized shall be saved.'

This contrast raises serious doubts. Does the glorious gospel of St. Paul, so much beyond the teaching of the Synoptic Gospels, rest on anything better than a few casual passages quoted by him from the Old Testament? To this question the Fourth Gospel gives a decisive answer. In an ancient document accepted throughout the Roman Empire, from the middle of the second century onwards, without a shadow of doubt, as written by a beloved disciple of Christ, and containing many internal marks of historical truth and accuracy, we find a record of the life and teaching of Christ in which salvation by *faith* is as conspicuous as in the letters of St. Paul. It is found also in an Epistle proved by evidence external and internal to be from the same author.

In Jn 1^{1-3} we find, in full harmony with the teaching of Paul yet going beyond it, homage paid to Christ as in the beginning the Companion of God, Himself God, and the Agent of whatever began to be. In v.[12] we read that 'To those who *believe* in his name, he gave a right to become children of God': a remarkable coincidence with Gal 3^{26}, Ro $8^{16. 17}$. In Jn $3^{15-18. 36}$, with a repetition recalling Ro $1^{16. 17}$ 3^{21-30}, we read that 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, in order that every one who *believes* in him . . . may have eternal life.' So chs. 5^{24} $6^{29. 35. 40. 47}$ $7^{38. 39}$ 11^{25} 12^{46} 14^{12}, and conspicuously in 20^{31}; also 1 Jn $5^{1. 4. 5. 10. 13}$. In Jn $3^{16. 18. 36}$ we have also escape from judgment already pronounced on those who do not *believe*, from the anger of God, and from destruction. This is equivalent to the salvation and justification by *faith* announced by St. Paul. Thus under phraseology peculiar to each of these two great teachers, revealing independent thought, we have the same good tidings of salvation for all who *believe*.

On the other hand, we notice the absence from the Gospel and Epistle of John of St. Paul's peculiar teaching about the spiritual significance of the Law, especially in Romans and Galatians; of the

distinctive phrases, 'righteousness of God through faith,' and 'justified by faith'; the believers escape from the Law, *e.g.* Ro $7^{4.6}$, and elsewhere frequently; the word *adoption*, a Roman legal process; and the phrases *crucified, dead, risen with* Christ. The above legal point of view is in the New Testament peculiar to the pupil of Gamaliel, an honoured teacher of law (Ac 5^{34}).

Another conspicuous element in the letters of St. Paul is the phrase *in Christ* in Ro $6^{11.23}$ $8^{1.2.39}$ 9^{1}, Eph $1^{1.3.4.6.7.10.11.12.13}$, and elsewhere frequently. So also the correlative phrase *Christ in you* in Ro 8^{10}, Gal 2^{20}, Eph 3^{17}, Col 1^{27}. A remarkable counterpart is found in Jn 6^{56} 14^{20}; and is further developed in the Parable of the Vine in ch. 15^{1-7}. So also in 1 Jn $2^{5.6.24}$ 3^{6}. Similarly *in God* and *God in us* in ch. $4^{13.15.16}$; cp. 1 Th 1^{1}. Notice also the distinctive word *abide* in Christ; in contrast to the letters of St. Paul, *e.g.* Eph 3^{17}, where we have κατοικῆσαι instead of μένει. This remarkable teaching, that Christ is Himself both the living environment and refuge and home of His people and the inward animating principle of their life, is another most valuable element common to these two writers, in contrast to the Synoptic Gospels: and in each it has a distinctive phraseology. Similar words are found in 1 P 3^{16} $5^{10.14}$, Jude 1.

Of these remarkable phenomena, the only explanation is that these great doctrines are due to the One Teacher at whose feet sat all the apostles. If Christ spoke words equivalent to those recorded in the Fourth Gospel, we can understand their reappearance, after decades during which they had been treasured in the memory and heart of a beloved disciple, in the Fourth Gospel, re-echoed also in the First Epistle of John; and that by intercourse with him and others who had heard Christ, St. Paul had learnt these doctrines and their deep significance. That, by some channel unknown to us, St. Paul's gospel came from Christ, he asserts plainly in Gal $1^{11.12}$, Ac 26^{18}, and assumes throughout his Epistles. And the amazing effects of his preaching, of which I have proved above that these doctrines were the centre, and of the same teaching in all subsequent ages, are complete proof that they come from God and are essential truth.

In other words, just as the four Gospels, compared each with the others, afford abundant evidence of their substantial historical truth, so the Fourth Gospel finds, in the letters and recorded addresses of St. Paul, decisive confirmation of the divine origin and essential truth of the message of Christ to men as therein set forth.

II.

In the light of the above evidence, we come now to discuss the less important question of authorship. In Mt $4^{18.21}$, Mk 1^{16-20}, Lk 5^{1-11}, at the opening of Christ's public ministry, we notice at once the conspicuous prominence of two pairs of brothers, partners as fishermen on the Lake of Galilee. In all four Gospels and in the Book of Acts, Peter is the most prominent. And closely associated with him as an inner circle within the twelve apostles, we find in Mk 1^{29} 5^{37} 9^{2} 13^{3} 14^{33}, and their parallels, James and John, sons of Zebedee, the second pair of brothers just mentioned. Of these brothers, one was again associated with Peter in Ac $3^{1.3.4.11}$ $4^{13.19}$ 8^{14}; and the other is said in ch. 12^{2} to have been put to death.

Strange to say, in the Fourth Gospel, among the many vivid pictures of men associated with Christ, we never find the names of James or John, and only in ch. 21^{2} a casual mention of 'the sons of Zebedee.' Along with this remarkable omission of two names almost at the head of all lists of the apostles, we find in Jn 13^{23} 19^{26} 20^{2} $21^{7.20}$ an anonymous 'disciple whom Jesus loved,' closely associated with Peter; cp. also ch. $18^{15.16}$. To his care, from the cross, Christ committed His mother.

Who was this disciple, and why was his name so carefully concealed? The only explanation, and a sufficient explanation, is the unanimous and confident tradition in the early Church that he was John the son of Zebedee; that to him we owe the Fourth Gospel; and that his modesty moved him to hold back his own name and his brother's, even when narrating incidents in which they took part.

This tradition confirms strongly the Fourth Gospel as a correct report of the teaching of Christ; and thus confirms St. Paul's teaching about salvation by faith and the believer's inward and mutual relation to Christ as a correct inference from the actual words of Christ. It is needless to inquire how this information reached St. Paul. We know (Gal $1^{18.19}$) that he went to Jerusalem to interview Peter, and remained with him fifteen days, and that there he found also 'James, the Lord's brother.' Many years later (ch. 2^{1}) we find him in

Jerusalem along with 'James and Cephas and John.' By various intercourse with the apostles and others who had heard Christ, St. Paul's inquiring mind would learn much about the Master's teaching. Admit once that teaching equivalent to that recorded in the Fourth Gospel was spoken by Christ, and we can well understand how a man like Paul would infer from it the doctrines embodied, in forms peculiar to his own legal training and disposition, in his letters and addresses.

The same tradition explains the First Epistle of John. Of its intrinsic worth, we have proof in three golden words in 1 Jn $4^{8.16}$, which tell us more about the inmost moral nature of God than any other words in the Bible: God is Love. The similarity, independence, and worth of the Gospel and Epistle reveal their common origin. And this can be no other than the beloved Apostle, John the son of Zebedee.

All this does not imply that in the Fourth Gospel we have the *ipsissima verba* of Christ; but only that this document gives a substantially correct account of His teaching, in such forms as would best convey its significance. And this is suggested by the form in which these discourses have reached us.

III.

This conclusion has also important bearing on the authorship of the Book of Revelation. This last work claims four times to have been written by 'John,' who, however, does not call himself either an apostle or a son of Zebedee, but only 'a servant' of Christ, a 'brother,' and a 'partner in the affliction in Jesus' (ch. $1^{1.9}$). A very early, yet not unanimous, tradition attributes it to the Apostle John. But strange grammatical forms, unparalleled in Greek literature, the writer's readiness to mention his name, in contrast to the strange reticence of the author of the Fourth Gospel and First Epistle, the love for the concrete in contrast to the equally characteristic abstract teaching of the other two books, and, what is still more remarkable, the total absence of the distinctive teaching noted above, make it in the last degree unlikely that the three works are from the same writer. Of these differences, only the last claims attention here: the others have been well stated by other writers, and are universally admitted.

In the Book of Revelation the word *believe*, so frequent in the Fourth Gospel, and the doctrine of salvation by *faith* never occur; nor does any equivalent. Nor have we the distinctive teaching of the believer's *abiding in* Christ and Christ *in* him. In the theological types in the New Testament, the Fourth Gospel and the Book of Revelation are, in these and other respects, at opposite poles.

Now, if the Fourth Gospel is from the son of Zebedee, he must have learnt these distinctive and life-giving doctrines from intimate intercourse with Christ; and they must have taken the deep hold of his mind and heart which in later years found embodiment in his Gospel and Epistle. It is impossible that doctrines so deeply implanted and bearing so closely on the believer's inner life could have left no trace whatever in a work so long and so spiritual as the Book of Revelation; and afterwards reappeared in the Gospel and Epistle.

This unlikeliness does not seriously weaken the powerful evidence adduced by Bishop Westcott for the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel, supplemented as it is in this paper by evidence from the letters of St. Paul. For, in this last case, strong traditional evidence is strongly confirmed by various internal indications, including the absence of the name of John the son of Zebedee, so conspicuous in the Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts; whereas we have nothing else in the New Testament, except the name *John*, which links the Book of Revelation with the Apostle John. While, therefore, insufficiency of evidence leaves the authorship of the latter open to doubt, we may accept with reasonable certainty the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

This last judgment is accepted and strongly supported by Dr. Westcott; but he considers that the differences between the Gospel and First Epistle of John and the Book of Revelation 'are not inconsistent with identity of authorship.' His statement of these differences seems to me inadequate: and he passes in silence over the great doctrinal differences noted above, involving a different conception of the message of Christ to men. This last evidence is also omitted by Professor Swete, who, however, states the differences more fully than does Dr. Westcott, and admits their force. He states also an alternative suggestion, and asks on p. clxxx, 'Was it John the son of Zebedee who lived in Asia and was exiled to Patmos, or was it the mysterious Elder, who was

distinguished by Papias from the apostle of the same name? A fair case may be made for either view. . . . While inclining to the traditional view which holds that the author of the Apocalypse was the Apostle John, the present writer desires to keep an open mind upon the question.' This cautious opinion seems to me to be overborne by the overlooked evidence adduced in this paper.

Dr. Moffatt, in his recently published *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, after 'Prolegomena,' appropriately discusses in ch. i. 'The correspondence of Paul'; in which he includes, and accepts as genuine, all the Epistles attributed to him except those to the Ephesians, to Timothy, and to Titus. Then follows in ch. ii. 'The historical literature,' including the Gospels of Mark and Matthew and the 'Writings of Luke (Gospel and Acts).' Then come, in ch. iii., 'Homilies and Pastorals,' including all else in the New Testament, except (ch. iv.) 'The Apocalypse of John' and (ch. v.) 'The Fourth Gospel' and 'A Johannine Tract (1 John).' He thus, in his table of 'Contents' separates conspicuously the Fourth Gospel from 'the historical literature' of the New Testament.

The historical worth of the Fourth Gospel he does not discuss, contenting himself with saying, on p. 533, 'That the Fourth Gospel presupposes the general synoptic tradition may be taken for granted; the real problem of literary criticism is to determine whether it can be shown to have used any or all of the synoptic gospels.' He passes over in silence, apparently as unworthy of consideration, the traditional apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and the important evidence and arguments adduced in support of it by Bishop Westcott and many others, giving no tangible reasons. Yet on p. 544, touching 'The date of the Crucifixion,' Dr. Moffatt rejects as unlikely the plain statement in Mk 14^{12}, Mt 26^{17}, Lk 22^{7}; and accepts as 'the better tradition' a reasonable inference from Jn 13^{1} 18^{28}, namely, that the paschal lamb was slain and the passover eaten on the evening after the death of Christ. This admitted accuracy in an important matter of time, as against the admitted inaccuracy of the Synoptic Gospels, gives, along with much else in it, to the Fourth Gospel a better claim to be considered an historical document. Yet this claim is ignored.

On p. 502, Dr. Moffatt anticipates the present paper by saying, 'The strong linguistic presumption against the theory that the relationship of the two books (the Gospel and the Book of Revelation) is one of common authorship, is amply corroborated by the differences of religious thought, christological, spiritual, and eschatological.'

On p. 509 he says that 'The hypothesis of John the apostle's authorship (of the Book of Revelation) is ruled out by the acceptance of the tradition of his early martyrdom (see below, Chap. V. (*c*)).' On p. 559, this is used as an argument against the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel: 'Since John the apostle was martyred early, the only available hypotheses of this kind are those which make the historical narrative come from a disciple of John, and merely the discourses from the apostle himself.' The same assumption meets us again on p. 596. To make the assumption first and at once to build arguments upon it, and to give the proofs long afterwards, is a most unscientific order.

On p. 602, the proof is given. 'The evidence for the early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee is, in fact, threefold: (*a*) a prophecy of Jesus preserved in Mk 10^{39}, Mt 20^{23} (*b*) the witness of Papias, and (*c*) the calendars of the church.' But (*a*) Christ's words, 'The cup which I drink, ye shall drink, and with the baptism with which I am baptized, ye shall be baptized,' by no means assert or even suggest that both brothers were to suffer at the same time. Nor does (*b*) 'the witness of Papias,' who is quoted as saying that John 'was killed by the Jews, thus plainly fulfilling along with his brother the prophecy of Christ regarding them and their own confession and common agreement concerning him.' That in (*c*) 'some ancient calendars' the two brothers were commemorated as martyrs, cannot be called decisive proof of martyrdom at the same time. Surely this uncertain evidence is of no avail against the plain testimony of Irenæus, that 'John the disciple of the Lord' continued with the elders of Asia 'till the times of Trajan.' Certainly it does nothing to overturn the various and abundant evidence that to the Apostle John we owe the Fourth Gospel. Moreover, in Gal $2^{1.9}$, we find him living long after (Ac 12^{2}) the death of James.

Dr. Moffatt does nothing to explain the omission from the same Gospel of all mention of two out of the three members of the inner circle of the apostles.

As 'Sources' of the Fourth Gospel, he

mentions on p. 522, 'apart from the O.T. (*a*) Paulinism, (*b*) the Jewish Alexandrian philosophy, and (*c*) Stoicism.' This admits what I have said above about the underlying harmony between the letters of Paul and the Fourth Gospel. But this by no means implies that the latter was taken from the former: for both may have come from a common source. Moreover, Dr. Moffatt does not tell us from what source, other than the Old Testament, St. Paul derived his Paulinism.

The Apostle tells us plainly (Gal 1^{12}) that he received his Gospel from Christ. The Fourth Gospel declares that the discourses in it were spoken by Him. And we have seen in this paper that the former is a legitimate development of the latter. This profound harmony, amid marked differences of form, reveals a common source. And the infinite value of the doctrines common to these two writers, as attested in the inward and outward life of unnumbered thousands of devout men and women, is decisive confirmation of the claims clearly made by these writers that their teaching is the message of Christ to men, and a correct announcement of the mind and will of God.

To sum up. We have found abundant and decisive evidence that the Fourth Gospel is a correct account of what Christ did and taught and is; also evidence sufficient for reasonable certainty that the Gospel and First Epistle are due, directly or indirectly, to the Beloved Apostle. To the same apostle, a very ancient, but not unanimous, tradition attributes the Book of Revelation. But internal evidence makes this common origin extremely unlikely; and leaves us in complete uncertainty about the author of this last work. On the other hand, its infinite value, and especially the honour therein paid to Christ as an object of the worship and the songs of the brightest in heaven, and the significance attributed to His death, in complete harmony with the rest of the New Testament, claim for the Book of Revelation the place it holds in our Bibles as the completion of the Sacred Records of the Christian Church.

In the Study.

Recent Literature in Apologetic.

The Rev. J. O. Bevan, M.A., F.G.S., F.S.A., Rector of Chillenden, Canterbury, is somewhat of the mind of those who held that 'they did not know everything down in Judee.' He does not think that St. Paul knew everything. And in a book entitled *S. Paul in the Light of To-day* (Allenson; 1s. 6d. net), he mentions some of the things which St. Paul either did not know or was not sure about. Nevertheless there is no flippancy or presumption in the book. There is a sincere desire to understand St. Paul as a man of the twentieth century may be able to understand him.

The Cambridge University Press, as agent for the publications of the University of Chicago, has issued a volume on that curious question, *The Historicity of Jesus* (6s. net). The author of the book is Professor Shirley Jackson Case, of the Department of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. And so thoroughly has Professor Case done his work, that for all English-speaking people the historicity of Jesus will be settled. It takes a special type of mind to consent to spend precious days in such an undertaking. But the reward is worth it. For not only does Professor Case assure us that Jesus was, he also assures us that He is.

There is scarcely a topic of interest for the Church of the present day that is not discussed in *Renascence of Faith*, by Richard Roberts (Cassell; 6s.). And every topic is discussed with decision of mind and with the command of precise, picturesque language. At the very beginning of the book, before the first page is finished, we come to the conclusion that this vigorous young writer will allow no vague sentiment or obscuring emotion to stand in the way of the mind in its search for truth. And we suspect that long before we are done with the book we shall have gone through a good deal of theological novelty. But with every page the writer's horizon widens; he takes more account of man's whole being; he stands more manifestly in awful boldness before God. His mental vigil-

ance is never relaxed; his determination not to be hoodwinked never slackens. And it is with a great bound of joy that we come at last to realize that this vigorous writer, this alert modern thinker, finds no rest for the sole of his foot anywhere but just on that very spot where the Apostle Paul planted his feet, with whom he says, not as repetition but by verified experience, 'I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' The first merit of the book is the delight of language with which the author records the modern search for truth and rest; its last merit is the rich simplicity of his faith in the Redeemer Christ.

In his book entitled *Faith and the New Testament* (T. & T. Clark; 2s. net), the Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, M.A., carries us back to the time in which the New Testament was slowly receiving its present form. In five easily read chapters he shows us what the problem was, how oral tradition went about its work, how the canon and text got settled, how ideas of inspiration affected the settlement, and how the Church and the New Testament influenced one another. This at last is the book, short, scholarly and sufficient, which the Sunday School teacher and even the preacher has been inquiring for in order to know when and how the books of the New Testament obtained their present place and authority.

In our search after the fundamental things we have reached the Person of Christ. How have we reached it? Not by the way of systematic theology and the formation of dogma, but from the study of the Gospels and the humanity of Jesus—the very road along which St. John travelled when he reached 'And the Word was God.' A great book on the Person of Christ by Professor Hugh Mackintosh will soon appear. Meantime we have a book of considerable immediate service, by the Rev. E. Digges la Touche, M.A., Litt.D. It is the Donnellan Lecture for 1911–12. Its title is *The Person of Christ in Modern Thought* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net).

There is no side of the subject unvisited. With the history—and what a history it is—Dr. la Touche is familiar; but he gives the most of his space and strength to the recent approaches towards such a doctrine as will satisfy scientific thought. One after another the 'Schools' are surveyed and set aside, until at last we find ourselves face to face with the self-revelation of the Lord and the great mystery that the human life is an act of will imposing self-limitation on the Divine. The book closes with a convincing chapter by the Rev. T. C. Hammond, M.A., on 'Consciousness and the Subconscious.'

The word 'Westminster' is much in demand as a title of books. Is it the Abbey or the Houses of Parliament that possess the attraction? The latest use of it is to name a 'Series of Manuals for Catholic Priests and Students,' to be edited by the Right Rev. Mgr. Bernard Ward and the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., and to be published by Messrs. Longman.

The first volume is entitled *The Mass* (6s. net). It is further described as 'A Study of the Roman Liturgy.' It is written by Dr. Adrian Fortescue. Now Dr. Adrian Fortescue not only writes the most beautiful penmanship you ever saw, but also one of the most idiomatic and effective of English styles. And then he is a scholar. He is a scholar in your sense of the word and mine. He is scientific and sensible; he is not swamped in scholasticism, nor is he suffocated in slippery questions of casuistry. This volume, which it is an ecstasy even to handle, will become a familiar friend to all liturgiologists, outside as well as inside the Roman communion.

Professor Francis J. Hall, D.D., of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, is manifestly an industrious author, for already he has published seven volumes of considerable size. He is also, however, and as manifestly, an author of ability; for every one of these volumes has had a flattering reception and has taken its place even in carefully selected libraries. But his eighth volume will do more than all the rest together to establish his reputation as a scientific theologian. Its subject is *Evolution and the Fall* (Longmans; 6s. net). It is a subject which demands fair and competent discussion beyond almost all others, and yet apologetes and theologians have consented to walk round it and discuss thoroughly everything else. No doubt it requires a rather unusual equipment—sufficient biological as well as sufficient theological knowledge. Dr. Hall has both. And with both he has the candid understanding. First of all, in his heart of hearts he knows that 'the word

of the Lord endureth for ever'; then his research and his writing are without prejudice and without fear.

To those who minister to a diseased body the first necessity is accurately to diagnose the disease. That is also the first demand made on those who minister to a mind diseased. Dr. Charles Reynolds Brown, Dean of the Theological School of Yale University, finds that his patients have lost confidence in the doctrinal statements accepted by them in earlier days as the very words of eternal life. They have an uneasy feeling because 'the traditional phrases of religious speech do not set forth with unstrained naturalness and transparent sincerity the facts of their religious lives.' Some of them have thrown away all such statements and are offering their devotions at the altar of an 'Unknown God.' Others with more conservative instincts have retained the phrases, but with a yearning to have them restated in terms of actual life. And he has written his book on *The Main Points in Christian Belief* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net) for the purpose of showing that faith in Christ, the Son of God and Saviour of men, is a reality. He has written it with personal conviction, in clear language, and without dogmatism.

The Coming Age of Faith is an encouraging title for a book (Memorial Hall, London; 2s. 6d. net). And it is the more heartening that the book is written by one of the younger and more scholarly ministers of the Congregational Church, the Rev. J. G. James, D.Lit., M.A., of Christ Church, Enfield. The book is divided into thirteen chapters, every one of which discusses the place of faith in one or other of its aspects or applications to life. First we have the demand for faith; next the connexion of faith with modern psychology; then the relation of faith to dogma. And so from step to step we pass through faith in the historical Jesus to the mystic union to Christ by faith, and end with the necessity of faith for effective service. The coming age is the age of faith—faith and effective work and quiet confidence. The past has been the age of criticism and doubt and fear. Dr. James is altogether right; and so candid is he, and so conscientious, that this book will be one of the bells to ring in the Christ that is to be.

The great word till recently has been Power. But now Power is giving way to Efficiency. What is the difference? Perhaps Efficiency includes the activity of man as well as the inspiration of God. And if a Church or an individual is to fulfil the high calling of God there must certainly be co-operation. So it is of *Efficiency in the Church of England* that Dr. W. Cunningham writes (Murray; 2s. 6d. net). His book has been suggested by the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church Finance, but its range is very much wider than that Committee's instructions.

The William Belden Noble Lectures for 1911 were delivered in Harvard by Dr. W. T. Grenfell, the great Greenland medical missionary. Coming from a man of so much physical vitality and mental manhood, their heroic faith and burning love for Christ must have told with tremendous effect upon the students of Harvard University. And now as they appear on the printed page they are able to bring students everywhere to a saving knowledge of the truth. For Dr. Grenfell can preach with the pen as well as with the voice. The title of the book is *The Adventure of Life* (Nisbet; 3s. 6d. net).

The great obstacle to the progress of missionary interest among the home churches is the lack of imagination. That gift is as precious now as was the Word of the Lord in the days of Samuel. What are we to do when it is not to be found? One thing we can do. We can seek out books or men who are able to make the life of other peoples and tribes so real to us that we see it without the exercise of the imagination. That is not easy. But one man has accomplished it. The Rev. Campbell N. Moody, M.A., has accomplished it for Formosa. Under the title of *The Saints of Formosa* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net) he has described the life and worship of the Chinese Christians of that island so graphically that the most ordinary understanding can realize it. And he has done it with so much sympathy that he captures the heart as well as the head. There has not been seen for years a better persuasive to missionary interest than this book.

Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis is one of the most immediately acceptable of American essayists, and we could prophesy that he will remain acceptable

long after most of the others have been forgotten. For he has no temporary tricks of eloquence or emotion. He produces his books at regular intervals. Each book costs time and toil. When it appears it differs from all that went before it.

The new book is called *The Battle of Principles* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). It is the story, in short biographical chapters, of the Heroism and Eloquence of the Anti-Slavery conflict.

In connexion with the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee, there is a 'Sewanee Theological Library' edited by the Rev. Arthur R. Gray, sometime Chaplain of the University of the South. Of this Library, two volumes have already been issued, Bishop Hall's *The Doctrine of the Church* and Dean Hart's *The Book of Common Prayer*. The third volume, just out, is *An Introduction to the Study of Christian Apologetics*, by the general editor (Sewanee: The University Press; $1.50). The author of the book has tried to keep two distinct classes of readers in mind, the clergy and laity of the Church who desire a simple readable statement of what is most surely believed in the Episcopal Church of America, and candidates for Holy Orders who must 'get up' the book for examination.

With the single word *Authority* as its title, Messrs. Sherman, French & Co. of Boston have published a book by Mr. A. v. C. P. Huizinga which discusses 'the function of authority in life and its relation to legalism in Ethics and Religion' ($2.25 net). It covers an immense territory and quotes freely as it goes. But the important thing is the conclusion it comes to. The conclusion is that the final authority in religion, the final authority over life and conduct, is the cross of Christ. The book ends with a quotation from an article by Principal P. T. Forsyth in the *Contemporary Review* for October 1899, the subject of which is 'The Cross as the Final Seat of Authority.' 'Dr. Forsyth's words,' he says, 'are a fitting close to the drift and temper of this discussion.' But before making the quotation he says, as the sum of the whole matter, 'The source and seat of man's final authority is, therefore, God at the heart of man (common grace), especially where man responds by faith to His gracious revelation (special grace).'

We must not preach ethics as if it had only to be touched with emotion to make it religion. But we must not preach religion as if it were independent of ethics. In *Christianity and Business* (Unwin; 2s. 6d. net), Mr. Edward Grubb is very ethical, but it is simply because he is already very religious. He brings the demands of the grace of God face to face with the competition of the market-place. And he knows what the market-place means. While others theorize about socialism, he moves among the socialists, bearing the gospel.

Virginibus Puerisque.

By the Rev. James Rutherford, B.D.

'Pilate answered, What I have written I have written.'—Jn 19^{22}.

It was very like the strong Roman Governor to say this. Pilate had written an inscription and put it above Christ's head on the Cross—'This is Jesus, the King of the Jews.' The Jews did not like it. 'Behold your King,' Pilate said. This is the kind of king the Jews would have, nailed to that wood, this peasant crowned with thorns and purple with his own blood: 'Behold *your* King!' The sting went home, and the priests came to Pilate and asked him to change it. They wanted him to write, not 'This is the King,' but 'This is Jesus who pretended to be King'—Jesus the Pretender. But Pilate put on all his stubbornness and said, 'No; let the board stay where it is, and the black letters above His head: Pilate does not change his mind: What I have written I have written.'

When Pilate said this, there was a deeper truth in the words than Pilate knew. It was true of everything he had done. By his deeds Pilate had been writing the story of his own life, day after day and page after page: and as he looked back upon it he could say this. It is just as true of our life as it was of his. Look back to-day and see. Think of that old year and all the years. 'What I have written I have written.'

There are three lessons about life in the text!—

1. It tells us that every life is a separate life. It is like a separate book, like your copy-book. You say, 'I did it all myself, my own self: it is what *I* have written.'

There is something very impressive in this—that your life is something all by itself: it is your

own—*you* did it. When the snow comes you like to look across it, and walk across it, and break up new ground, and then look round and see the marks that you have made. At the seaside when the ebbing tide has made the sand smooth and soft, you like to walk across it where nobody has walked before. Look in front of you across the snow or the sand—what a smooth unbroken surface! But look back—there is the track of your steps, the marks you have printed on it as you have come across it. It is your own separate line. It is what *I* have written.

2. It tells us that life is like writing in this too—that it is characteristic. It is like yourself. There is character in it. In this way too it is your own.

Some people say that if you will send them a few lines of your handwriting and a certain number of stamps, they will tell you all about yourself, for they say that they can read your character from your penmanship. There is just a bit of truth in this. There is something of character that escapes in writing. How differently people write! The writing of some is so neat and exact and precise and perfect: and of some—so large and bold and confident and free; and of some—so shrinking and timid and uncertain: and of some—so indolent and easy and careless and confused. You can describe the writing by the same adjectives that describe character. Perhaps there is just a bit of truth in it. There is some character in writing. At any rate your life is like yourself. As you write *it* day by day you are putting into it your character.

3. But the chief thing this world tells us about life is this—that when it is written it remains. 'What I have written is written': what is done is done: what is past is past. You cannot get it back to alter it or blot it out. It remains.

So it happens in your life. What you wrote yesterday or last year you cannot change. It is written on your memory, and you cannot forget it. It is written on your character, and you cannot lose the mark of it. It is written on others by your influence, and you cannot take it back.

I think this is a very solemn thought—that we make marks on others that never come out. I remember when I was a little fellow, I was playing with a boy bigger than myself. I suppose we quarrelled about something, and he lost his temper and took his revenge on me. There is a little mark on my lip, a tiny scar; it has been there for more than thirty years, and it will be there as long as I live. When that boy lost his temper he was writing something on my body which has never been taken out. So when you influence another for good and evil, when you lead another into temptation, when you tell a wicked story—or when you help another to do right, then by your influence you are making your mark on another, you are writing something that will never come out.

'What I have written I have written.' You say, What is the use of telling us that the past can never be changed? Just that you may be more careful in the future. God is always giving us new chances. Every day He turns the leaf and gives us a new page. The past is gone and we cannot alter it. The old year is like a shut book which we can never open to change or blot out anything. But the New Year is another book, an open book with a clean white page for every new morning. Can we begin it without thought and prayer? We have no power over the past, but the future we can make what we please. What I have written I have written, but what am I going to write? Can I not do better on the next page?

Illustrations of Spiritual Truths from Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall.'

By the Rev. G. A. Frank Knight, M.A., F.R.S.E., Perth.

Vol. ii. p. 289. 'According to the strictness of ecclesiastical language, the first of the *Christian* emperors was unworthy of that name, till the moment of his death; since it was only during his last illness that he received, as a catechumen, the imposition of hands, and was afterwards admitted, by the initiatory rites of baptism, into the number of the faithful.

It was an arduous task to eradicate the habits and prejudices of his education, to acknowledge the divine power of Christ, and to understand that the truth of *his* revelation was incompatible with the worship of the gods.'

It is an equally hard task with many to-day. They are prone to believe that they can serve the world and Christ at the same time, and it is often only after many years that they discover that Christ and Belial can have no 'concord' (2 Co 6^{15}). Even when this discovery is made, the sin-loving heart rather clings to Belial, than embraces the austere purity of Christ: and the definite decision for what conscience declares to be right is sometimes postponed till an ever further and further off date.

Vol. ii. p. 290. '[Constantine] artfully balanced the hopes and fears of his subjects by publishing in the same year two edicts, the first of which enjoined the solemn observance of Sunday, and the second directed the regular consultation of the Aruspices.'

'How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him' (1 K 18^{21}).

'No man can serve two masters' (Mt 6^{24}).

Vol. ii. p. 332. '[Constantine] invited bishop Acesius to the Council of Nice, and gently ridiculed the narrow tenets of his sect by a familiar jest, which, from the mouth of a sovereign, must have been received with applause and gratitude. . . . The emperor said to the bishop, "Acesius, take a ladder, and get up to Heaven by yourself."'

'Even the imperceptible sect of the Rogatians could affirm, without a blush, that, when Christ should descend to judge the earth, he would find his true religion preserved only in a few nameless villages of the Cæsarean Mauritania' (p. 335).

There are some sects to-day, and some individual Christians, equally narrow in their views as to what constitutes true Christianity, to which these same sarcasms might well be applied!

Vol. ii. p. 366 *n.* 'Eunapius has related a strange example of the cruelty and credulity of Constantine. The eloquent Sopater, a Syrian philosopher, enjoyed his friendship, and provoked the resentment of Ablavius, his Prætorian præfect. The corn-fleet was detained for want of a south wind: the people of Constantinople were discontented; and Sopater was beheaded, on a charge that he had *bound* the winds by the power of magic.'

'At that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage to them which by nature are no gods: but now that ye have come to know God, or rather are known by God, how turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again?' (Gal $4^{8.9}$).

Vol. ii. p. 377. 'On the memorable night when the church of St. Theonas was invested by the troops of Syrianus, the archbishop [Athanasius], seated on his throne, expected, with calm and intrepid dignity, the approach of death. While the public devotion was interrupted by shouts of rage and cries of terror, he animated his trembling congregation to express their religious confidence, by chanting one of the psalms of David. . . . The doors were at length burst open; a cloud of arrows was discharged among the people: the soldiers, with drawn swords, rushed forward into the sanctuary: and the dreadful gleam of their armour was reflected by the holy luminaries which burnt round the altar . . . the darkness and tumult of the night favoured the retreat of the archbishop . . . and he eluded the eager search of the soldiers.'

'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee. Trust ye in the Lord for ever: for in the Lord Jehovah is an everlasting rock' (Is $26^{3.4}$).

Vol. ii. p. 383. In the election of a new bishop of Rome 'the adherents of Felix were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the public places, in the baths, and even in the churches; and the face of Rome, upon the return of a Christian bishop, renewed the horrid image of the massacre of Marius and the proscriptions of Sylla. . . . A strong and powerful faction of Infidels . . . ridiculed, even on their theatres, the theological disputes of the Church.'

'The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written' (Ro 2^{24}).

Vol. ii. p. 386. The cruelty of the Arians. 'The rites of baptism were conferred on women and

children, who, for that purpose, had been torn from the arms of their friends and parents: the mouths of the communicants were held open, by a wooden engine, while the consecrated bread was forced down their throat: the breasts of tender virgins were either burnt with red-hot egg-shells or inhumanly compressed between sharp and heavy boards.'

'The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service. And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, *nor me*' (Jn $16^{2.3}$).

Vol. ii. p. 387. 'Whole troops of those who were styled heretics were massacred, particularly at Cyzicus, and at Samosata. In Paphlagonia, Bithynia, Galatia, and in many other provinces, towns and villages were laid waste and utterly destroyed.'

'If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another' (Gal 5^{15}).

Vol. ii. p. 389. 'The Circumcellions indulged without control their intemperance and avarice, burnt the villages which they had pillaged, and reigned the licentious tyrants of the open country. . . . Many of these fanatics were possessed with the horror of life, and the desire of martyrdom, and they deemed it of little moment by what means, or by what hands, they perished, if their conduct was sanctified by the intention of devoting themselves to the glory of the true faith and the hope of eternal happiness. . . . They frequently stopped travellers on the public highways, and obliged them to inflict the stroke of martyrdom, by the promise of a reward, if they consented, and by the threat of instant death, if they refused, to grant so very singular a favour. When they were disappointed of every other resource, they announced the day on which, in the presence of their friends and brethren, they should cast themselves headlong from some lofty rock: and many precipices were shown, which had acquired fame by the number of religious suicides.'

'But these, as creatures without reason, born mere animals to be taken and destroyed, railing in matters whereof they are ignorant, shall in their destroying surely be destroyed . . . these are springs without water, and mists driven by a storm, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved' (2 P $2^{12.17}$).

'Shepherds that without fear feed themselves . . . wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame' (Jude $^{12.13}$).

Vol. ii. p. 390. 'The experience of Ammianus had convinced him that the enmity of the Christians towards each other surpassed the fury of savage beasts against man; and Gregory Nazianzen most pathetically laments that the kingdom of heaven was converted, by discord, into the image of chaos, of a nocturnal tempest, and of hell itself.'

What a terrible commentary on the words of Christ—'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another!' (Jn 14^{35}).

Vol. ii. p. 427. 'During the games of the circus, [Julian] had, imprudently or designedly, performed the manumission of a slave in the presence of the consul. The moment he was reminded that he had trespassed on the jurisdiction of *another* magistrate, he condemned himself to pay a fine of ten pounds of gold; and embraced this public occasion of declaring to the world that he was subject, like the rest of his fellow-citizens, to the laws, and even to the power, of the republic.'

'Let *every soul* be subject unto the higher powers: for there is no power but of God, the powers that be are ordained of God' (Ro 13^{1}).

Vol. ii. p. 440. While Julian was being initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries, 'in the silence of the night' and amid 'horrid sounds and fiery apparitions'; 'in a momentary panic he made the sign of the cross.'

So to-day many a man who has turned his back on his early faith, when suddenly brought face to face with death in some awful form (*e.g.* shipwreck), will revert to his early beliefs, and attempt to use them as a charm to ward off the impending catastrophe. Repetitions of childhood's prayers, learned at a mother's knee, are sometimes not unknown, not from a desire for amendment of life, but from a superstitious idea that thereby the 'offended Powers' will be propitiated.

Vol. ii. p. 456. 'It might perhaps have been ex-

pected that the influence of the place [Jerusalem] and the belief of a perpetual miracle [the continuous self-propagating power of the *true cross*!] should have produced some salutary effects on the morals as well as on the faith of the people. Yet the most respectable of the ecclesiastical writers have been obliged to confess, not only that the streets of Jerusalem were filled with the incessant tumult of business and pleasure, but that every species of vice, adultery, theft, idolatry, poisoning, murder was familiar to the inhabitants of the holy city.'

In Christ's time it was the same—'He said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer: but ye have made it a den of thieves' (Mt 21^{13}).

Closely parallel was the state of Rome when Luther visited it in search of light to his soul. External sanctity, and gross superstitions, can never render men internally holy.

Vol. ii. p. 460. 'As he was sensible that the Christians gloried in the name of their Redeemer, he countenanced, and perhaps enjoined, the use of the less honourable appellation of GALILÆANS . . . the Platonists believed in the mysterious virtue of words, and Julian's dislike for the name of Christ might proceed from superstition, as well as from contempt' (*n*).

If one could analyze all the hidden motives of modern unbelief, in how many cases might 'superstition,' and not merely rationalism, be found to be the *fons et origo*!

Vol. ii. p. 498. The secret undermining, by a subterranean passage-way, of the city of Maogamalcha, with the subsequent introduction of 1500 troops, and the storming and demolition of the town, affords a vivid analogy to the secret undermining of character by some small insidious sin leading to the utter destruction of the individual concerned.

Vol. ii. p. 508. 'The credulous Julian receiving the traitor [Hormisdas] into his bosom, was persuaded to issue a hasty order, which, in the opinion of mankind, appeared to arraign his prudence, and to endanger his safety. He destroyed, in a single hour, the whole navy, which had been transported above 500 miles, at so great expense of toil, of treasure, and of blood. . . . The Christian bishops, Gregory and Augustin, insult the madness of the apostate, who executed, with his own hands, the sentence of divine justice.'

'The prosperity of fools shall destroy them' (Pr 1^{32}).

Vol. ii. p. 515. 'Julian the apostate in his dying oration addressed his companions thus: "I die without remorse, as I have lived without guilt. I am pleased to reflect on the innocence of my private life; and I can affirm, with confidence, that the supreme authority, that emanation of the Divine Power, has been preserved in my hands pure and immaculate."'

'The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God, be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you, This man went down to his house justified rather than the other' (Lk $18^{11.\ 14}$).

(*To be continued.*)

The Raising of Lazarus.

BY THE REV. J. E. ROBERTS, M.A., B.D., MANCHESTER.

IT is usual to consider the raising of Lazarus as a stupendous miracle in which the power of Jesus Christ reaches its climax. From this point of view difficulties are suggested both by the silence of the Synoptists, and by features in the miracle itself. But probably the miracle looms so large before us because it is described with such skill and detail. It is difficult to see why raising Lazarus to life was a more stupendous miracle than raising Jairus' daughter or the widow of Nain's son. Indeed, if it was true when John's messengers were sent back to their imprisoned

master that 'the dead are raised,' the last miracle of the kind cannot have aroused quite such tense excitement amongst the disciples as we are accustomed to imagine.

There is another standpoint from which to approach the story. Did our Lord intend the miracle to be a striking public event? On the contrary, there are indications that even if the miracle were necessary, it was intended to be as private—if the word may be used—as possible. The delay of Jesus before leaving Perea; the proposal that they should go again unto Judæa, Bethany not being named then; the fact that Jesus halted outside the village, where the sisters came to him secretly, though the secrecy was foiled by the fussiness of the Jews; and especially the 'groaning' of Jesus twice referred to: these are at least in harmony with the theory that the miracle was performed reluctantly. Our Lord was compelled to recall Lazarus from the grave because of the lack of faith on the part of His followers. And one reason why John relates the story so fully is because it was a miracle which, in the light of subsequent events, marked a decisive step in the Lord's training of the Twelve and of His other disciples in their understanding of His message.

Was there anything peculiar about the death of Lazarus? This is the significant fact: his death was probably the first break in the inner circle of the intimate friends of Jesus. The relations between the Master and the family in Bethany were specially close. Martha and Mary and Lazarus were amongst those who believed in Him (cp. 11^{27}); whilst Jesus 'loved' them. They did not belong to that multitude who followed Him out of curiosity, or who were moved by passing enthusiasm. They were true believers and intimate friends. So Jesus said to the disciples, 'Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep.' The death of Lazarus may be thought of as the first Christian death.

For this reason the passing of this man whom Jesus loved, assumed immense importance in the eyes of the Lord. It served to test the faith of His followers. In Cæsarea-Philippi He had asked, 'Who say ye that I am?' Now He can watch what influence His teaching about God and life has had on His own disciples. He has tried to weave the thought of God's Fatherly love into the very texture of their thinking. He has laboured to correct their imperfect views of death, and of life, and of heaven; to lead them to the serene and radiant heights where men stand with God with sunlight in their soul. How far has He succeeded? Has He lifted these genuine believers above the current views of death? Have they understood His words about the Father in heaven who 'is not the God of the dead, but of the living'? Have they caught any glimpse at all of the glory that gleams on the mountains of eternity beyond the shadows of the valley?

The whole trend of the narrative is to convince us that our Lord was deeply disappointed by what He saw and heard at that critical time. First of all, the Twelve quite misunderstand Him when He refers to death as 'sleep'; the word only suggests to them 'taking rest in sleep.' Then they are afraid of returning to Judea because He is menaced there with death, and that is to them the end of all things. Also Martha and Mary show themselves to be without any spark of Christian hope. They share the view of many Jews that men may 'rise at the last day.' But they are overwhelmed with the sense of unutterable loss. No suggestion that Lazarus has 'risen' in any spiritual sense occurs to them. So entirely are they at the old level that they are surrounded with the customary crowd of mourners, with whose wailing their own weeping mingles. The whole story is full of the pathos of death, of its poignant grief, of its pain, its partings, its perishing. There is nothing Christian about the attitude of any of these believers in Jesus. Death is viewed by them in the old hopeless way.

Is not this why 'Jesus groaned in spirit and was troubled'? The element of 'indignation' suggested by the latter word corresponds to the complete failure even of His intimate friends to comprehend some of His most earnest messages. They are still bound by the old Jewish beliefs and by the old Jewish customs. The sympathy which the pitying Lord did feel with the bereaved sisters was accompanied by a deep disappointment that nothing but His own death and resurrection could free these captive souls from the chains of their crushing fear of death.

Following this line of thought, it is possible to trace through the story the attempts of Jesus to create and to sustain a Christian view of death. 'He abode two days in the place where he was.'

Was not that delay an effort to get the bereaved sisters and the disciples to recognize the neglected truth? The leisure was not meant to enhance the wonder of the miracle. It was the patience of the Saviour, willing, even at cost to Himself and to them, to lead His slow children into a bigger faith. He wanted to deliver them from the bondage of their old beliefs, to see if they could escape unto the freedom He offered. When He met Martha, He endeavoured to lead her to a more spiritual view of death and of the resurrection. By His immortal word, 'I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die,' He seems to be almost pleading with her not to ask for Lazarus to be brought back. It is a striking fact that Jesus ventured to bring a dead Christian back to this world. In the light of His own teaching about the life after death, it is difficult to believe that He would do this willingly. In the same light, who of us would dare to recall any of the beloved dead, even if we had the power? There are signs of the real reluctance of Jesus to perform such a miracle. It is as though He would not have done it, if the faith of the friends had allowed Lazarus to go. Only the obvious impossibility of convincing them of His power over death, or of getting them to understand His teaching, in any other way, drove Him to recall a friend who had crossed the bourne into God's presence, thus compelling him to face the grisly shadow a second time. And now, as always, unbelief brought suffering in its train. The sisters had to suffer by the two days' delay; Lazarus had to suffer by being called back to earth. Moreover, the miracle involved suffering for the Lord Himself. By intensifying the hatred of the Jews, and by hastening their preparations to put Him to death, the miracle which His friends' lack of faith compelled Him to perform, did the last thing they would have wished; it brought His enemies upon Jesus, and humanly speaking was the occasion of His arrest and crucifixion. We conclude, then, that the miracle was intended to be a staff on which weak faith might lean. Jesus would have preferred that faith should walk without the staff. But it was not strong enough yet to go alone. So He yielded to the frailty of His followers, and recalled the dead man for a season. This was not, however, a resurrection in the true sense. Lazarus had to face death a second time. The Lord could only prolong His friend's earthly life and postpone the time of his departure. For He has a far higher and more wonderful truth to teach than the postponement of death. He has come to fulfil the ancient promise, 'He shall swallow up death in victory.' This was the magnificent message given to the world on the Easter morning. His own resurrection was a resurrection indeed; not the temporary return of a dead man to the earthly existence, but the triumphant rising of a dead man out of the power of death into endless life. If only His friends could have believed Him, death never did separate the souls of the godly from their heavenly Father; but such a faith had been beyond their grasp until the majestic victory of the empty grave strengthened their hearts to lay hold on eternal life. This was the confidence which the Lord tried to discover when Lazarus died. Inasmuch as it was lacking, He summoned the dead friend back for a while, in order that the faith of believers might have one more support. But the goal to which He was leading them then, and to which He did bring them on Easter-day, was the radiant conviction that 'death hath no more dominion over us.' The grace of God the Father encompasses us at all times; and in that smiling sun-kissed sea of love we may sink out of sight all our sad, hopeless, despairing ideas of death.

Therefore, when we penetrate to the deeper meaning of this miracle, we are led past the gates of wonder or of admiration, up to the inner door of trust in God. We are bidden expect greater things from God than lie upon the surface of life visible to every chance passer-by. Our Lord seeks to break the chains by which we are tied and bound to the tangible. We must not bury our hopes in the tombs where the bodies of our dead are laid. They are not dead; for 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' Neither are we destined for death. We are children of the light and of the day. Our brows were made for amaranthine flowers.

For such as we there should be no bondage to the things seen. The mountains encircling our city are full of horses and chariots of fire round about us.

Earth's crammed with heaven,
And every common bush afire with God.

The failure of Martha and Mary and the disciples to rise to this higher view of life even after months of intimate communion with Jesus Christ, reminds us how easy it is to pass by the 'great sight' without taking off one's shoes.

> The teeming air and prodigal,
> Which drops its azure over all,
> Is full of immortalities
> That look on us with unseen eyes.

But the immortalities may be neglected by us, as they were not seen by the sorrowing sisters. The grandeur of the Easter message is that it convinced the disciples of the immortalities and of their magnificence. All who live on this side of the empty grave in the garden, have the witness that was wanting in Bethany. Such dull and faithless scholarship as makes the Master groan in the spirit, becomes much more blameworthy after 'He is risen.'

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

From the House of Gaius to the Delectable Mountains.

In this section of the allegory neither the characters nor the subjects are such as to warrant the style of treatment which we have given to the earlier divisions of this part. There are many incidents and a remarkable tripping style which suggests a continuous rather than a topical treatment. The characters of Christiana and Mercy are considerably developed in it, and remind us, more than once, of Mr. Lynch's suggestion that the model for the former was Bunyan's second wife, and for the latter the wife of his youth.[1]

There is an unusual lightness in the style, and now and again an actual play of words, as when By-ends comes to an ill end, or when certain prove themselves rather strangers to pilgrims than strangers and pilgrims. Also the allegory is even more elastic here than formerly, and admits the two Scripture characters of Gaius and Mnason apparently without any significance except such as may be found in the fact that they are mentioned honourably in the New Testament. To pass from such symbolical characters as the Interpreter and Good-will to historical ones like these, is to change the mode of the work from that of the Morality to that of the Miracle Play. Whatever other significance there may be in the incidents of the Inn of Gaius and the House of Mnason, nothing of that is made clear; and it is perhaps safest to take them simply as incidents of the road to carry forward the story and introduce conversations.

Before we come to Gaius' house, however, we have a curious little notice of a momentary false alarm. A very much scared man comes running to tell them of a danger which turns out to be nothing at all. The incident may perhaps be introduced simply to break the monotony and enliven the tale, or perhaps it may be of the nature of a warning to be wary. Great-heart remains throughout this section the same extraordinary man, whose form of religion is such that he has no misgiving in it whatever.

Mr. A. C. Benson says of Great-heart's point of view, 'What an extraordinary form of religion it all was! There was not the least misgiving in the mind of the authors. The Bible was to him a perfectly unquestioned manifesto of the mind of God, and solved everything and anything.'[2]

They go into the inn without knocking, and are provided with two rooms and a plain supper. The cook, with the name of 'Taste-what-is-good,' reminds one of similar names frequently invented by Langland, such as Piers the Ploughman's wife's name, Work-when-it-is-time.

They vote in formal fashion, using the parliamentary phrase 'content' for assenting, and there is an old-fashioned familiarity between host and

[1] Brown, ii. 28.

[2] Benson, *Beside Still Waters*, 128–129.

guests which tells of the hospitalities and friendliness of the inns of ancient days. It is a very different host from Chaucer's, and yet there is the same personal interest in his people, and the same air of importance in their management. He is a rather expansive and prosy old gentleman, who has not very much to say, but says it at great length and with a complacent air of being extraordinarily well pleased with himself, and of having found that the honest and Christian life has paid him well. He cannot lay a trencher without pointing a moral; and indeed the physical and the spiritual food are not a little mixed in this incident.

The most curious part of Gaius' conversation relates to the genealogy of Christian. This he traces partly from Scripture, and partly from Fox's *Book of Martyrs*, back along the line of Stephen and James, Paul and Peter, Ignatius, Romanus, and Polycarp. It is needless to point out how here, again, the allegory breaks down. The name of Christian before his conversion was Graceless, and his town Destruction, so that this family tree can only be regarded in a spiritual sense. But the allegory is never held very firmly in this portion, for, while the boys are still small enough to be put to bed by Mercy, as by their nurse, we find immediately afterwards arrangements being made for the marriage of two of them. The finest point in the story of that first day in Gaius' house is the loyalty of the children to their father's memory.

There is a good word spoken in a rather patronizing way for women, and a long account of what various women did for Jesus, which ends up with the somewhat meagre conclusion, 'Women, therefore, are highly favoured, and show by these things that they are sharers with us in the grace of life.' The old gentleman is an inveterate matchmaker, and sets Christiana looking for wives for her sons in the most shameless fashion. Matthew eventually marries Mercy, while Gaius, with remarkable perspicuity and good judgment, secures James for his own daughter. It is really very difficult to forgive the marriage of Matthew to Mercy. Matthew certainly needed Mercy in every sense of the word, but, for the young lady's sake, Matthew seems poor enough. Even in this section Matthew drivels continually, telling us how the cloth makes him feel hungry, and asking questions of the usual silliness. 'May we eat apples, since it was they by and with which the serpent beguiled our first mother?' And the subject of eating apples immediately gets him back to his favourite theme, his sickness after his own feast upon the forbidden fruit.

The symbolism of the supper table is very curious and fanciful with its wave-breast and heave-shoulder, its significant wine and milk, butter and honey, apples and nuts—the nuts suggesting a sort of game of riddles which they play around the table. The boys are sent to bed, but the rest find this rather feeble amusement so interesting that they sit up all night at it. Honest, however, gets sleepy and nods; and perhaps there is a slight suggestion that if the real truth were told the conversation is hardly brilliant enough to keep awake for, in the fact that it is Honest who is overcome. But it is worth while for us to sit up with them in order to hear the last part of Honest's conversation about the young man and the old man who went on pilgrimage. Honest is an old man, but he is free from all prejudice and smallness, nor does he grudge the young and suspect that the old are being pushed aside. He admits that the young man has more credit of his pilgrimage, because his passions are stronger and resistance requires more effort; nor does he add, as he might well have done, that there is another side to this, and that older men, whose vitality indeed is less, have also lost those safeguards of youthful idealism, which are so effective as weapons of defence. Indeed, the old have their own peculiar temptations, which, on the whole, are probably more dangerous than those of youth.

At daybreak the family rise and hold a sort of Bible Reading or Experience Meeting upon the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, which is distinguished by one fine thought of Great-heart's. His answer to the question, why Jesus seems to have no form or comeliness, is, 'Because they want that eye that can see into our prince's heart.' That is a true and noble canon for judging Jesus Christ. Without it men may say any unworthy thing they please about Him. It is a matter of taste, and if they see no beauty that they should desire Him, it will be difficult to convince them; but those who have the eye that can see into His heart, princely and wounded both, see Him so fair and wonderful that there is none in all the earth to compare with Him.

Slaygood.

Gaius leads them out of hunting in the fields, the quarry being giants as usual. This Slaygood has generally been taken for one more aspect of persecution, one of the blood-men that were out after Nonconformists in those days. So little is told us about him that it is very difficult to come to any definite conclusion. In Mr. Feeble-mind's account of himself, he says, 'When he had got me into his den, *since I went not with him willingly*, I believed I should come out alive again.' This appears to hint at some form of sin rather than a persecuting State; but the matter is difficult to decide, and perhaps the main use of the incident is to introduce Mr. Feeble-mind, who is certainly the most interesting character we have met for some time. Slight, however, though the account of the fight is, and presenting no new features beyond those which we have seen in former encounters, there is the zest of undisguised desire for revenge, which reminds us of that grim story of the execution of Robespierre, when, as the head fell from the block, a woman in the crowd was heard to cry, 'A second time!' When Slaygood is slain his head is brought away to the inn and set up upon a pole.

Mr. Feeble-mind

This pilgrim is found in the hands of Slaygood, who is rifling him, as a preparation for eating him. He tells us his own story, how he was a sickly man, and had become a pilgrim because Death had knocked at his door once a day. How he lived in the town of Uncertain and had no strength either of body or of mind. It is a pitiful character, full of morbid self-consciousness, and, indeed, self-pity, but it is a piece of most excellent writing in which Bunyan describes it, and the end redeems it all, 'As to the main, I thank Him that loved me, I am fixed: My way is before me, my mind is beyond the river that has no bridge—though I am, as you see, but of a feeble mind.'

Mr. Feeble-mind seems to stand for the seventeenth-century form of that habit of doubting which has become a chronic and recognized form of spiritual disease in our later time. There is, however, in Feeble-mind a spark of faith beneath the doubt, and at the beginning of the passage which we have already quoted, as the brilliant conclusion to his account of himself, Bunyan puts the sidenote, 'Mark this.'

'This I have resolved on, to wit, to *run* when I can, to *go* when I cannot run, and to *creep* when I cannot go.'

The anticlimax of running, going, and creeping reminds us of Isaiah's famous verses (40^{31}), and it must be remembered that while the pace is lessening both in Isaiah and in Feeble-mind, the difficulty and the courage may be increasing correspondingly, so that what appears to be an anticlimax may really in God's eyes be a climax after all.

The whole character of Feeble-mind is tenderly drawn, and shows how gently the weak are judged by strong men like John Bunyan. In a later passage, when they are preparing to set out, Feeble-mind's objections to going with them give us a passage in the style of Dickens' caricature. He tells us that he shall like no laughing, and that he shall often be offended, so as to be a burden both to himself and to his companions. In this passage the tenderness of Bunyan has certainly grown very bold. The weak brother taking himself for granted in this fashion becomes quite intolerable. To know oneself weak is bad enough, but to arrange for being weak all through the journey, and to confess oneself a burden and a nuisance to other pilgrims, is for any man to take himself with indefensible seriousness. Stevenson was not too severe when he said, 'for, to be quite honest, the weak brother is the worst of mankind.'

This very self-centred question, with his miserable little envyings of better men, and his perpetually repeated use of the first person singular, does certainly seem to be treated with an unnecessary consideration. Surely the best treatment for such men is to attempt at least to awaken in them some trace of shame and anger, which may be the beginning of their strength. Yet Great-heart is as kindly as Christian, willing to make any sacrifices so that he may have this poor creature's company; and the whole passage shows us how far Christianity is prepared to go in its defence and kindness towards the unfit. It has indeed a right to do so, for it is the only system which not only compassionates but changes the unfit, and makes the weak become strong.

Fearing and Not-right.

Through a question of Mr. Honest's the conversation turns upon Fearing, who, it seems, belongs to

that same town of Stupidity which is also the native town of Honest, and who turns out to be Feeble-mind's uncle. Honest, with his usual plain speech, and perhaps unnecessary candour, says, 'You have his whitely look, a cast like his with your eye, and your speech is much alike.' As for Mr. Not-right, he is merely incidental, and seems to be introduced for no other purpose than that expressed in the verses sung by Mr. Feeble-mind, to show how some, by escaping immediate danger, run upon ultimate destruction, while others by undergoing loss and trial acquire ultimate gain. It is but another variant upon the old text and principle, 'He that saveth his life shall lose it.' There is a parting feast, a disclaimer of any reckoning of the hospitalities of the house (which again makes us wonder what manner of inn this may be), and the pilgrims begin to prepare for the journey. There follows that curious passage between Great-heart and Feeble-mind, which we have already noticed, in which Feeble-mind protests his many weaknesses as the reason why he should be left behind to go on his way alone, and Great-heart insists upon self-denial for his sake, which will enable him to find the company of the rest congenial. Just at this point there appears another weak pilgrim, Mr. Ready-to-Halt, with his crutches in his hand. The crutches appear to be the promises of Scripture, or indeed any other help than a man's own faith, will, and energy. His advent is immensely cheerful to Feeble-mind, and indeed the two are well matched. The collection of weaklings is growing now, and before long we shall have a company like that of Lk 14^{21}. It may, indeed, have been this passage that was in the mind of Bunyan. Certainly the insistence upon the care and compassion of Christianity for weaklings is intentional and emphatic.

> So long as men were merely weak, not bad,
> He loved men.[1]

They go on their way to the accompaniment of profitable talk concerning Christian and Faithful, but it must be confessed that the talk never rises above an extremely dull level, and is little else than mere recapitulation of details from Part One.

[1] Cf. Browning.

Literature.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

It is a curious experience for a reader to come from a study of the Robertson Smith case, as it is so admirably retold by Dr. Sutherland Black in Smith's biography, to the Kerr Lectures for 1911–1912. The Kerr Lectures were delivered in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, by the Rev. Adam C. Welch, Theol. D., their subject being *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. Welch is indebted to Robertson Smith. What writer on the Prophets is not? But how calmly he takes for granted all that Robertson Smith fought and suffered for. 'The adversary,' as Smith used to call his opponents, concentrated on the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. Mosaic indeed! Dr. Welch deliberately declines to discuss the authorship, for he allows nothing to distract his mind from his own proper subject, which is the religion. But the position in which he places that book in this volume is enough. He places it last of all, after Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. That is enough to show that the Prophets did not derive their religion from the author of Deuteronomy, but the author of Deuteronomy from the Prophets.

Nevertheless this is not a book that the most conservative student of the Old Testament need be afraid of. Its subject, as we have said, is the religion of Israel. And as students of the religion we are not seriously concerned with the question of precedence. If Isaiah was more and Moses less of an original force in the history of religion, what does it matter? It is the history of religion that matters. And Dr. Welch has described the religion throughout the period of the kingdom with extraordinary success. One thing comes out most conspicuously. The historical method makes the religious supremacy of Israel more marvellous than ever; more than ever we ask with astonishment how it came to pass that this least of all lands, and this most stubborn of all people, were most highly honoured and most religiously endowed.

THE SCIENCE OF LOGIC.

Dr. P. Coffey, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Maynooth College, has been favourably

known for some time as the translator into English of Professor de Wulf's books on Scholasticism and the History of the Mediæval Philosophy. He has now written a book in two volumes under the title of *The Science of Logic* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net each), by means of which his name will certainly become more widely and still more favourably known.

Although in two large volumes, *The Science of Logic* has been written for the use of beginners. It has been Professor Coffey's duty to prepare students for the entrance and the degree examinations, both of the late Royal University of Ireland and of the present National University. In fulfilling that duty he has had much experience of the rawness of the student's mind and the need of properly elementary instruction, and he has been strongly impressed with the fact that there is no text-book in existence covering the whole ground and at the same time sufficiently simple. He has himself supplied the deficiency. Certainly these two thick volumes are somewhat forbidding to the eye of the boy who is about to prepare for an entrance examination. But they are not so forbidding as they look, for Dr. Coffey has had the more advanced student also in his mind and has thrown the matter specially intended for him into small type, so that the elementary student has to make himself master of the large type only. Besides, Professor Coffey writes in so concrete a manner and with the command of so much simple Saxon, that the demand made upon the intellect of the Irish Catholic student is as light as it is possible to make it. Whether these volumes will be found acceptable to other examiners it is not easy to predict. They have their advantages, but there are also some obstacles in their way.

The chief, and perhaps the only serious, obstacle is the fact that the system of logic expounded in the book is the scholastic system. Of that the author makes no secret. He seems rather to make a parade of it. But that obstacle to the circulation of the book is not so serious as it seems at first sight to be. Nor is it so serious as the author himself seems anxious to make it appear. The truth is Professor Coffey was bound to follow Aristotle and his scholastic interpretation, no other system being allowed entrance in those founts of learning with which he has to do. But he is modern enough and scientific enough to realize the inadequacy of scholastic logic to meet the needs of modern and scientific thought. And accordingly a very large part of his book is occupied with the agreeable attempt to permeate the scholastic system with ideas that are at heart antagonistic to it. He says himself, and openly, even in the preface, that it is necessary for the Catholic student in these days to know the method of inductive science. He has accordingly taken pains to bring the special claims of induction to the attention of the scholastic logicians.

We think, therefore, that this book has very considerable significance in relation to intellectual progress. The author tells us that amongst the books which he has most frequently consulted are Keynes's *Formal Logic* and Joseph's *Introduction to Logic*, and the influence of these books is felt from beginning to end. That and other modern influences will make themselves felt, however insensibly, and the student who passes into the National University of Ireland through the study of this important book will never afterwards be purely and simply a scholastic.

VICTOR HUGO.

There is a new fashion in biography coming in. The late Mr. A. F. Davidson wrote a biography of Victor Hugo, giving it the title of *Victor Hugo: His Life and Work* (Eveleigh Nash; 15s. net). He died before he was able to see his book through the press. But that service has been competently rendered by Mr. Francis Gribble. The book is well edited, well printed, well illustrated, and well bound. Everything in its outward appearance that could be done for it has been done. And it is a true book, an entertaining book, even a great book. If its style of biography is the right style, it is one of the best short biographies in the language.

But is this the proper way to write a biography? There are three possible ways, appreciation, depreciation, and—biography. When Dr. Alexander Whyte wrote on Newman, he wrote an appreciation, and called his book so. When Mr. Purcell wrote the Life of Cardinal Manning, he wrote a depreciation, leaving his readers to call it so. Mr. Davidson has written a depreciation of Victor Hugo. It is not a book to be mentioned in the same breath as Mr. Purcell's *Cardinal Manning*. Mr. Davidson has the sense of decency and can write English. But if he sets down nought in malice, he never misses his opportunity of suggesting another motive

than that which Victor Hugo himself would have wished us to accept. And this is the more surprising and the more inexplicable when we discover that he has a genuine admiration for Victor Hugo. It was not interest in him as 'a bad man' that led him to write his biography; it was recognition of his greatness and of the influence for good which he had upon the world.

It is easy for Mr. Davidson's friends to apologize for him. Mr. Gribble scarcely sees that an apology is required. It is easy to say that in biography as in everything else we must now be scientific, tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. It is easy to assure us that we must see the man as he was, and not as we should like him to have been. But will such an apology stand? Do we see the man as he was? Does any one believe that Mr. Purcell's biography gives us Cardinal Manning as he was? And, in any case, we had much rather have the rule regarding the dead, *nil nisi bonum*, rigidly respected, than the most scientific portrait that ever was painted with pen, if it deprives the world of one of its great and good.

THE EZRA-APOCALYPSE.

Professor Sanday has written a prefatory note to a critical commentary by Mr. G. H. Box, M.A., on *The Ezra-Apocalypse* (Pitman; 10s. 6d. net). A 'prefatory note' he probably calls it himself, but there are almost eight closely printed pages of it, and it is full of matter. As a rule we believe these introductions to books, introductions by another hand than the author's, are a mistake. They seem to say, and sometimes do say openly, that the reader is not fit to judge the book for himself. But this note is a great delight.

The Ezra-Apocalypse is chapters 3 and 4 of the book commonly known as 4 Ezra or II. Esdras. Now the joy of Dr. Sanday's prefatory note is that it contains a frank and charmingly expressed criticism of the book. It is almost as if we had two books on the Ezra-Apocalypse, the one balancing the other, so far as the authorship is concerned, and both giving excellent reasons for their findings. Of course the authorship is only a fraction of the contents of the book. We have a translation from a critically revised text, critical introductions, elaborate notes and explanations, not to speak of the general introduction, and an appendix which contains the Latin text. It is indeed just such an edition as Professor Charles has led us to look for, and as hitherto we have received from scarcely any one else. And it comes at a good time. Are we not at present absorbed with problems of apocalyptic more than with all other problems relating to the New Testament? How are these problems to be solved? In no other way than by the actual study of apocalypses like this. Mr. Box is in no hurry to find solutions for us. But all the while that he is contributing to their solution, however slowly, he gives us notes to keep us in countenance, like that long note on *Paradise* from page 195 onwards.

Return for a moment to Dr. Sanday's prefatory note; and let us quote his estimate of the religious value of this Apocalypse. 'I began,' he says, 'by saying that this fourth book of Ezra is second in value to none of the Apocalyptical and Pseudepigraphical books. When I say "in value," I mean especially in religious value. Other books are earlier in date, and, perhaps, throw light upon darker places. By the time that this book was written, Christianity was in full course; it is not only subsequent to the beginnings of Christian history, but to most, if not to all, of the New Testament. No other book presents so many points of contact with the New Testament. And yet the book is a pure product of Judaism; and it is the more significant and interesting because we may see represented in it both sides of Judaism; it belongs to the latest period in which there was still something like an even balance and fusion between the Apocalyptic and legalist ideals. With the death of R. Akiba in 135 A.D., legalism definitely triumphed; the Judaism of the future was to be a Judaism of the Talmud. But when 4 Ezra was written there was still room for that larger, broader, and more genial spirit which embraced both the divergent currents at the same time. It was written, too, at a time when the feelings of men were deeply stirred. Of all the tragedies of history there is none greater than the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. The author of 4 Ezra wrote while the impression of it was still fresh, when the first paralysis of feeling was beginning to give way, and something like coherent utterance was once more possible.'

The Rev. John Burgess, M.A., D.D., whose exposition of the Shorter Catechism we have

already heartily commended, is now engaged on a *Life of Christ*, as part of a series entitled 'New Testament Lessons for Use in Schools and Colleges.' He has published Part I. of the *Life of Christ* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson). It is manifestly the work of an experienced teacher. For every word that needs explanation is explained, and not a word that does not need it. The line of thought is traced, emphasis is laid on the central lesson, and hints are given for the application of the passage to life and conduct.

The *Transactions of the Baptist Historical Society* have entered upon their third volume. The first part contains nine short papers, the most charming of which seems to be a record of 'Early Days at Eythorne,' by Dr. W. T. Whitley. Eythorne is a valley in the Kentish Downs, six miles inland from Dover or Sandwich. It is as usual the scene of persecution, and as usual the more persecution the more progress.

One of the books we must always have at our hand is a good book of Chronology. For general purposes all other books have been superseded by Mr. R. J. Hart's *Chronos* (Bell & Sons; 6s. net). A marvel of industry and accuracy, it is worked on the comparative method, and is cleverly arranged. There is a full index of men and matters, but it will rarely have to be consulted, so easily is the method understood, and so quickly is the eye caught.

At the same time as the 'Life,' there has been published a volume of *Lectures and Essays of William Robertson Smith* (A. & C. Black; 10s. net). The contents of the volume have not all appeared in book form before. They are divided into six portions — Scientific Papers, Early Theological Essays, Early Aberdeen Lectures, Later Aberdeen Lectures, Arabian Studies, and Reviews of Books.

There are only two Reviews of Books, and they are short, but they are weighty. The one is a review of Wellhausen's *Geschichte Israels*, the other of Renan's *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*. The Aberdeen Lectures, earlier and later, are the most welcome of all the contents. They deal with matters that have lost none of their interest in the forty years or thereby which have passed since they were delivered—'What History teaches us to seek in the Bible,' 'The Place of the Old Testament in Religious Instruction,' 'The Place of Theology in the Work and Growth of the Church,' 'The Poetry of the Old Testament,' and the like—and besides their present interest, they do more than all the rest of the book to tell us what manner of man and teacher Robertson Smith was. But the two Arabian Studies are the most permanent contributions to science which the volume contains. One on 'Animal Tribes in the Old Testament' contains the celebrated discussion of Totemism—a discussion which is said to have sent Dr. J. G. Frazer out on his discoveries. The other, called 'A Journey in the Hejâz,' obtained for its author world-wide reputation as an Arabian traveller and the Adams Chair of Arabic in the University of Cambridge.

The Syndics of the Cambridge Press have sent us other three volumes of the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature' (1s. net each). They are *Methodism*, by Principal H. B. Workman; *A History of Civilization in Palestine*, by Professor R. A. S. Macalister; and *Ancient Assyria*, by Dr. C. H. W. Johns, Master of St. Catharine's College, Cambridge. These volumes are numbered 40, 41, and 42. Each of their authors is a master in Israel. It would be difficult, we believe it would be impossible, to name a higher authority in any of the subjects; and whether it is chance or not, each of them can write for the people. These volumes are not to be read and thrown away; they will be kept as books of reference.

One of the numerous enterprises of the Cambridge University Press is a series of volumes called the 'Cambridge Nature Study Series.' To this series Mr. J. A. Dell has contributed a volume entitled *The Gateways of Knowledge* (2s. 6d.). The gateways of knowledge are the senses; and so the book is an introduction to the study of the eye, the ear, the nose, and other organs as they may be seen at work by a well-trained observer. The book is so full and so practical that it is evident Mr. Dell makes a hobby of his subject. And the man who makes his hobby serve him is the man to write a book on it. Its illustrations, type and arrangement, make it a model text-book.

No. ix. of *Horae Semiticae* contains two narratives. One is 'a plain unvarnished tale which is not without human interest as a record of suffering for the Christian faith.' The other 'partakes

somewhat of the character of a romance, which, but for its religious setting, would have done no discredit to a volume of the Thousand and One Nights.' The two together give the title to the volume—*The Forty Martyrs of the Sinai Desert and the Story of Eulogios* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 7s. 6d. net). These two narratives, then, Mrs. Agnes Smith Lewis has transcribed and translated, and she has added a Syriac glossary. She purchased the MS. containing both in Egypt in 1906. It is a palimpsest, the under-script being in Palestinian Syriac, the language spoken by our Lord, and that very Galilean speech which 'bewrayed' Peter, as he sat at the fire and warmed himself. It belongs to the sixth century, and is therefore, says Mrs. Lewis, the earliest document of any length in the dialect.

They speak in America about 'running' the Church. Under the title of *Scientific Management in the Churches* (Cambridge University Press; 2s. net), Professor Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago tells us how to run it. It is machinery that he is concerned with. Machinery you must have, and the more efficient it is, even let us say the more up to date, the more the Church will prosper—if, of course, the power is present, which is here taken for granted. It is a good book and courageous.

The Rev. W. L. Watkinson, D.D., LL.D., is our incomparable and unapproachable sermon-maker, now that Dr. Maclaren has ceased to make sermons. In one respect, and it is most significant, he excels all the sermon-makers who ever lived. It is in the matter of illustration. He uses illustrations freely, even profusely; but they are so truly illustrative that our only cry is Give, give! Dr. Watkinson's new book has been published by Messrs. Cassell & Company. Its title is *Life's Unexpected Issues* (3s. 6d.).

Any page will serve to prove what has been said. Take page 97 at random:

'Wandering in the forests of the Amazon, and gazing up through the leafy canopy at the midnight heavens, the naturalist finds it easy to mistake the fireflies flitting among the foliage for the brightly shining stars; so are men apt to mistake the glittering things of the moment for the solid glories of eternity.'

Or this on page 165: 'A soldier told me the other day that the essential of accurate shooting is absolute cleanliness of the rifle barrel. He explained how a rifle is liable to fouling by particles of the bullet adhering to the bore of the rifle. This fouling is practically imperceptible to the naked eye, nor can the minute particles be detected by the ordinary process of cleaning. Yet these subtle metallic adhesions, however few, are fatal to really accurate shooting. They will deflect a bullet as much as three or four inches out of its course in a range of two hundred yards. As the Bisley bull's-eye is only four inches in diameter at that range, it follows that many a shot misses the centre, that many a prize is lost, because of the fouling of the barrel by these invisible particles. "Sin" is, literally, missing the mark. How often, then, have we missed our aim when we thought to reach the Divine purpose concerning us, because of the deflecting power of some bias of the heart!'

Mr. Clement C. J. Webb, Wilde Lecturer in Natural and Comparative Religion in the University of Oxford, delivered his inaugural lecture on February 2, 1912. It has been published at the Clarendon Press (1s. net), under the title of *Natural and Comparative Religion.*

There is no subject on earth but with sympathy and a conquering style may be made interesting. Hundreds and thousands who never heard of Aelfric of Eynsham will read Mr. Harvey Gem's *An Anglo-Saxon Abbot* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net), and will commend it to their friends. But the preacher of the gospel will take most pleasure in it. For here are sermon thoughts out of an old store, which by their very age are fresh and stimulating, every thought having the potency of an effective sermon in it, if it reaches the right soil. And where the sermon is not of much account, the devotional life will be nourished, and that both richly and right happily. What grace of election led Mr. Gem to this unknown à Kempis?

There are few men who know the depths of London degradation better than Mr. Thomas Holmes, the founder of the Home Workers' Aid Association, and now its organizer and manager. He has written a book which he calls *London's Underworld* (Dent; 7s. 6d. net). It is a book of cases, not cases for the medical man, we were

going to say, but for the man who believes he can minister to the mind diseased. But in reality they are nearly all cases for the medical man also. One striking thing about it is that the cases run so much according to type. It is a strange and terrible, almost a paralyzing thing; as if there were moulds for human beings to be run into, and they are run into them by the hundred. No doubt these moulds are sometimes breakable — bad houses, low wages, a surfeit of temptations to drinking. Let them be broken by all means. Yet it seems as if something would yet remain, as if humanity would remain fit only for such degradation. But no doubt that is the trial of our faith. And we must not forget that this is the victory which overcometh the world. One remedy Mr. Holmes persistently keeps before us is play. Give them the chance, he says, and they will play games, and it is at least one-half of their salvation.

Two publications from the Proceedings of the British Academy issued by Mr. Henry Frowde are *The Syriac Forms of New Testament Proper Names*, by Professor Burkitt (2s. net); and *Hittite Problems and the Excavation of Carchemish* (1s. net), by Mr. D. G. Hogarth.

A volume of *Seed Thoughts for Right Living*, by the Rev. Alvah Sabin Hobart, D.D., has been published by the Griffith and Rowland Press, Philadelphia (50 cents net). The thoughts seem suitable for preaching as well as for living, and probably are actually the essential ideas of a course of sermons. To each chapter the author adds questions for discussion and books for further reading.

To the Eucken literature add now a translation of the Nobel Lecture, that lecture which obtained the Nobel prize for Literature in 1908, and was delivered at Stockholm on March 27, 1909. Under the title of *Naturalism or Idealism?* the translation into English has been made by Mr. Alban G. Widgery, M.A. (Cambridge: Heffer; 1s. net).

Messrs. T. C. & E. C. Jack have published another batch of twelve of 'The People's Books.' 'The People's Books' have the advantage in price (6d. net) over both the Cambridge Manuals and Messrs. Williams & Norgate's Library, and they probably lose none of that advantage by being slightly smaller. The smaller the better, say the modern busy man and woman, if you can only persuade us that we know the subject when we have read the book. Here is a complete list of the twelve. It will enable those who are not taking the whole set to make their choice. It will be observed that with all the variety there is a considerable proportion of biography, showing that the editor and the publishers are wise in their generation; for whether or not the proper study of mankind is man, it is the most popular study. The volumes are: *The Foundations of Science*, by W. C. D. Whetham, M.A., F.R.S.; *Inorganic Chemistry*, by Professor E. C. C. Baly, F.R.S.; *Radiation*, by P. Phillips, D.Sc.; *Lord Kelvin*, by A. Russell, M.A., D.Sc., M.I.E.E.; *Huxley*, by Professor G. Leighton, M.D.; *The Growth of Freedom*, by H. W. Nevinson; *Julius Cæsar: Soldier, Statesman, Emperor*, by Hilary Hardinge; *England in the Middle Ages*, by Mrs. E. O'Neill, M.A.; *Francis Bacon*, by Professor A. R. Skemp, M.A.; *The Brontës*, by Miss Flora Masson; *A Dictionary of Synonyms*, by Austin K. Gray, B.A.; *Home Rule*, by L. G. Redmond Howard, with a Preface by Robert Harcourt, M.P.

Professor DuBose has written his autobiography, calling the book *Turning Points in my Life* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). He has written it with attractive brevity, as the price of the book must show. But the brevity is chiefly due to the fact that he has confined himself to his religious life and to the chief crises even of that. Professor DuBose calls himself a Catholic, using the word, he says, as expressing freedom of thought and conviction in religious matters. It is an unexpected use of the word. It seems at first sight illegitimate, but what he means is that being a Catholic does not hinder him from being also free. Being a Catholic, then (by which, of course, he does not mean being a Roman Catholic), he makes much of his own baptism, and declares that baptism is not made enough of by other people. We do not think that any well-trained theologian would challenge his doctrine of baptism. For he explicitly excludes anything of a magical or superstitious character from the rite; and most would agree with him that not nearly enough of emphasis is ordinarily put upon it.

Theory and practice follow close on one another's heels in a book on *Sunday School Teaching* (Longmans; 2s. net), edited by the Rev. H. A. Lester, M.A. Mere theorizing there is none. Every idea is set to work at once, and tested by its fitness to survive. The authors of the chapters are practical, experienced teachers, every one of them.

Mr. John Spargo and Dr. George Louis Arner have collaborated in the preparation of a text-book on socialism. The title is *Elements of Socialism* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net). It is not an easy task to accomplish. The fact of socialism is patent, the definition of it is nearly impossible. And without a definition, how can the thing be described? Our joint-authors have recognized this, and they have offered the best definition in their power. Four elements must enter into the definition of socialism. It is (1) a criticism of existing society; it is (2) a philosophy of social evolution; it is (3) a social forecast or ideal; and it is (4) a movement for the attainment of the ideal. Whereupon they offer, as embracing these four elements, the following provisional definition: 'Socialism is a criticism of existing society which attributes most of the poverty, vice, crime, and other social evils of to-day to the fact that, through the private or class ownership of the social forces of production and exchange, the actual producers of wealth are exploited by a class of non-producers; a theory of social evolution according to which the rate and direction of social evolution are mainly determined by the development of the economic factors of production, distribution, and exchange; a social forecast that the next epoch in the evolution of society will be distinguished by the social ownership and control of the principal agencies of production and exchange, and by an equalization of opportunity as a result of this socialization; a movement, primarily consisting of members of the wealth-producing class, which seeks to control all the powers of the State and to bring about the collective ownership and control of the principal means of production and exchange, in order that poverty, class antagonisms, vice and other ill results of the existing social system may be abolished, and that a new and better social system may be attained.'

On that definition the text-book is built. There is one object kept in view throughout and only one—the impartation of reliable knowledge. He who masters this book will be able not only to answer the examination questions it contains, but also to decide whether he should be a socialist or not.

Under the title of *South American Archaeology* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net) there has been published an introduction to the archæology of the South American continent, with special reference to the early history of Peru. The book, which has been written by Thomas A. Joyce, M.A., has been furnished with numerous illustrations and two maps. The illustrations in the text are 37 in number; there are also 26 plates in half-tone, and one plate in colours.

The archæology of South America is more difficult to make a student's manual of than even the archæology of the Bible; because on the one hand the information to be condensed is enormous, the reading of the literature being a lifetime's work; and on the other hand there are still large gaps with which nothing can be done until they are filled by the patient use of the spade. Mr. Joyce, accordingly, being as sensibly aware of these things as any one else, issues his text-book diffidently. It is at best the best that can be done at the present time, and for that and the handsome way in which the publishers have produced the book we are profoundly thankful. Mr. Joyce will be superseded, the sooner the better. Meantime this is the first book for the student to lay his hands upon.

What a fascinating study is the archæology of South America. What a surprise of art and ambition every other page of this book discloses. Mr. Joyce does no more than touch the subject of religion. The religions of Peru alone, as he properly says, would require a volume at least as large as this for their proper exposition. But even under his light touch what a surprise religion is. Mr. Joyce complains that Britain has done so little for the archæological discovery of South America. His book will surely help to remove that reproach.

Prebendary Yorke Fausset has revised his edition of Augustine's *De Catechizandis Rudibus* (Methuen; 2s. 6d. net). Let teachers and students take note of it. It is as good as any other book to begin the study of Augustine with.

A very elementary volume on *Bible Boys* has

been written by Lettice Bell (Morgan & Scott; 1s. net). The same publishers have issued a most moving biography of Chundra Lela, under the title of *An Indian Priestess* (1s. 6d. net). Lord Kinnaird truly says that the story is of the deepest interest, and is full of encouragement for workers in the mission field.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have also published new editions of Mr. Rogers' book on *The Tabernacle and its Services*, and of Mr. F. B. Meyer's exposition of *The Psalms*, the latter in two volumes (6d. net each).

Mr. Murray has published a cheap edition (1s. net) of Dean Stanley's *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*.

Mr. Eveleigh Nash has published a new and revised edition of *The Married Life of Anne of Austria*, by Martha Walker Freer. It is no surprise to find that the book has reached a second edition. Anne of Austria is a fine provoking subject for a biography, just because she was a piquant and provoking person to her husband, to Richelieu, and to many another. Her character presents matter for the student of psychology, as well as for the student of history. It is difficult to see what she owed her fascination to; but she fascinated not only the Duke of Buckingham, but also the people of Paris. It is difficult to see why she so fascinates us who have only her portrait and her biography. But there it is, a fascinating biography after the first 50 pages, a biography that becomes steadily more fascinating as we proceed with it.

To the series entitled 'Leaders of Revival' a volume has been contributed by the Right Rev. Bishop E. R. Hassé on *The Moravians* (National Free Church Council; 1s. net). Surely the Moravians could not have been left out; and no man could tell the story more appropriately than Bishop Hassé. The Bishop of Durham has written a short commendatory introduction.

The beginner in Hebrew may as well begin his reading with the Book of Ruth as with any other book. And if he does begin with the Book of Ruth he should use the edition of the Rev. R. H. J. Steuart, S.J.—*The Book of Ruth* (Nutt; 3s. 6d. net). It contains a word for word translation, notes on almost every word and phrase, a vocabulary, and all other things that are essential or even helpful to the beginner in Hebrew.

We are not done with Servetus yet; but Mr. David Cuthbertson will help us to a decision that may be final. He has printed that rarest of rare theological books, the *Christianismi Restitutio* which was published in 1553, and which along with two smaller works by the same author brought the name of Servetus into the heart of fierce controversy, out of which it has not escaped even yet. Under the title of *A Tragedy of the Reformation* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier) Mr. Cuthbertson has published a beautiful volume, illustrated as only a great librarian has the means and inclination to illustrate, in which he tells the whole story briefly and dispassionately.

For the volume on *The Children of Borneo* in the 'Children's Missionary Series,' Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier have been so fortunate as to secure Mr. Edwin H. Gomes, M.A., the author of *Seventeen Years among the Sea Dyaks of Borneo* (1s. 6d. net). And Mr. Gomes has been so fortunate as to have material for his purpose, most entertaining and most apposite, without riddling his former book. We have rather more here than the children of Borneo, but not more than the children of Britain will take pleasure in.

Between psychology and spiritualism lies inspiration. At least that seems to be the belief of the anonymous author of a book entitled *Rays of the Dawn; or, Fresh Teaching on Some New Testament Problems* (Kegan Paul; 3s. 6d. net). There is no startling novelty in the book, whether for devotion or for science; and the best of it is drawn from recognized sources of information, such as the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. But the author makes most, makes everything indeed, of the direct illumination which he has received, as he believes, from on high. Is it other than the uprising of the subconscious? Of that we all have experience. And truly enough the very words seem sometimes to be given to us unawares. Is the 'inspiration' this prophet receives other than that? By their fruits ye shall know them.

The eighth volume of the American lectures on the history of religions has been published

(Putnam; 6s. net). Its subject is *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans.* The lecturer and author of the book is Franz Cumont, Ph.D., LL.D., the well-known authority on Mithraism.

The subject is closely akin to that with which Professor Cumont's name is identified. He is simply carrying his researches further back, that he may discover an ancestry for Mithraism, and an explanation of its easy dissemination throughout the Greek and Roman world. And accordingly at least a third, the first third, of the book is occupied with the Chaldeans and with the influence of the Chaldeans on the Greeks. This field of religious investigation has recently been worked by the greatest living authority on the religion of the Greeks, Dr. L. R. Farnell, whose results have been given to us in his book entitled *Greece and Babylon.* Those who have read that book will proceed with this and will find it doubly interesting in consequence. Both books make it abundantly manifest that we are as yet only skimming the surface of this investigation. But it is a great thing to know that our investigators are men of such scholarship and restraint. There is no spinning of theories in order to fill up gaps in our knowledge.

Dr. Abram S. Isaacs, Ph.D., Professor of Semitics in New York University, thinks the time has come for the world to listen to a frank statement of the ideals for which the Jews live. So he has written 'a survey of Jewish life, thought, and achievement,' and published it under the title of *What is Judaism?* (Putnam; 5s. net). Do not let the word 'history' in the sub-title mislead us. It is not Israel's past, but her present history that Professor Isaacs is most concerned with. He tells us what the Jews have done in and for the United States and other countries. And his claim is that Judaism has contributed much to the riches of the nations in literature, in art, in ethics, and deserves recognition. It is thus to be observed that by 'Judaism' Professor Isaacs means more than the religion of the modern Jews. Yet he sees clearly enough, and says, that as religion made Israel in the past, it is religion that keeps the Israelites together still.

In a very minute but comprehensive volume there is contained an exposition by Bishop Moule of *The Supper of the Lord* (Religious Tract Society; 6d. net).

Rumours have reached this country from time to time of a movement in America, chiefly, it is believed, associated with the Methodist churches, entitled 'Church Brotherhood.' Its success is spoken of as 'phenomenal,' its attraction 'inestimable.' We now find the movement fully and sympathetically described in a volume called *Modern Church Brotherhoods*, written by Mr. W. B. Patterson, formerly the General Secretary of 'The Methodist Brotherhood' (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). In the last chapter we are told that the movement is spreading in England, and find that under the title are classed P.S.A., P.S.E., and the like.

'The earth and the fulness thereof, the world and all that dwell therein,' sings the Psalmist. The tourist contradicts him at once. Happening to meet an acquaintance in Cairo, he remarks, 'How small the world is after all.' But the Psalmist is right. How little, for example, do we know of that part of the full earth called Persia; how little of the inhabitants thereof called Nestorians. Mr. Robert E. Speer has written a large book to serve as biography of a medical missionary to the Nestorians, whose name was Joseph Plumb Cochran, M.D. And although he lived so noble a life as this book records, how few of us ever heard his name; how few of us know anything definite of the people he gave his life for. The title of the book is *The Foreign Doctor* (Revell; 6s. net).

The Rev. Herbert McLachlan, M.A., B.D., Tutor and Warden of the Unitarian Home Missionary College, Manchester, has written a book with the title of *St. Luke, Evangelist and Historian* (Manchester: Sherratt & Hughes; 2s. 6d. net); and Professor Peake has contributed an introduction to it. The introduction is so manifestly sincere and so exactly in touch with the real problems of the evangelist, that those who read it will proceed to the book with quickened appetite. This is rather a rare accomplishment for an introduction. And it is still more rare to find the book and the introduction agree as they do in this case. Mr. McLachlan is a scholar, and we need a little scholarship, or at least a little knowledge of Greek, to follow him. That granted, the rest is all profit.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has issued a second and revised edition of *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church,*

by the Rev. F. E. Warren, B.D., F.S.A. (5s.). The first edition was published in 1897. Since then the discovery of the Odes of Solomon and other relics of the early Church has furnished 'a certain amount of new material of a liturgical character,' and the use of this material, carefully worked into the book, makes the difference between the two editions.

The Archbishop of Melbourne, being chosen Moorhouse Lecturer for 1912, delivered a series of biographical lectures on the leaders of the Reformation in England—Wolsey, Cromwell, Cranmer, Parker, Bancroft, and Laud. His lectures are now published under the title of *Studies in the English Reformation* (S.P.C.K.; 5s.). The publishers have added portraits of the men, and Dr. Clarke has himself added notes and documents in a series of appendixes. The book, therefore, is much more than a popular repetition of things so often said before. It is a real addition to Reformation literature.

Dr. Eugene Stock has made 'A Biblical Study of Service to God and Man,' and published it under the title of *The Servant* (S.P.C.K.; 2s.). In doing so he has himself rendered a service to God and man of no small account. To the preacher he has rendered the greatest service of all. For it will be easy now to make Service the subject of one or more discourses; and it will be possible to gain some conception of the important place occupied by this word and thought in the Bible, and especially in the teaching of Christ.

Sir Hanbury Brown, K.C.M.G., has revised his famous book on *The Land of Goshen and the Exodus* for the second edition (Edward Stanford; 3s. net). Of the things that are new in the new edition one is that evidence is brought forward that Moses had conceived the plan of bringing Israel to Mount Horeb before he left Midian for Egypt. There is therefore a good deal in the book by way of commentary on the text Ex 3^{12}—'When thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this mountain.'

There are few promises for the future more to be relied upon or more to be rejoiced in than the evidence that comes from many quarters that men and women are giving themselves to a thorough study of the Gospels. We have passed through a critical time of criticism. But this thing at least it has done for us, it has made superficial reading of the Gospels for ever impossible.

A study of the Fourth Gospel comes to us from Edinburgh. Its contents were given to the students of the Women's Missionary College there, to the leaders of the Girls' Auxiliary (Missionary) of the United Free Church of Scotland, and to the members of the Student Christian Movement. Its author is Miss Annie Small; and the title *Studies in the Gospel of St. John* (Student Christian Movement; cloth, 2s. 6d. net; paper, 1s. 6d. net). Now there is nothing superficial about this book. Every word in the Gospel is tested, every argument is weighed, every experience is applied to life. Literature is made to yield its best by way of illustration, and the devotional life is fed by the printing of an occasional prayer, a prayer of throbbing sincerity and most acceptable simplicity. Thus illustrated and enforced the whole Gospel is here, yet in such wise as to keep the book within quite moderate dimensions. After the Prologue there are three great divisions of subject—the Word became Flesh, the Challenge, and the Response.

Mr. Fisher Unwin, as agent in this country for Baedeker's handbooks, has issued a new edition for 1912 of *Palestine and Syria* (14s. net). It is the fifth edition, and it has been not only revised in the ordinary way, but also remodelled and augmented. It contains 21 maps, 56 plans, and a panorama of Jerusalem. The literature has been brought up to date throughout. Thus the new abridged edition of Doughty's *Travels in Arabia Deserta*, published this very year, is taken account of. The phrase, 'the unchanging East,' is passing out of application, but it still applies when comparison is made between the East and the West. The hotel tariffs, for example, do not need the yearly revision in Palestine that they need elsewhere. But even the hotels have been attended to. Perhaps it is worth mentioning that Baedeker is almost as indispensable to students of the Bible who have no hope of ever visiting Palestine, as to those who are packing their portmanteau for the journey. Nowhere else at present is found the same completeness and condensation of information about Palestine and Syria.

From the University Studies of the University of Nebraska, the Professor of Social Anthropology, Dr. Hutton Webster, has reprinted a study of *Rest Days*. It is a comparative study in religion, and it gives us some idea of what the study of religion can do for the interpretation of the Bible, both Old Testament and New Testament. Here we see the religion of the Old Testament lying parallel with other religions, but with the marvel of inspiration and a God of righteousness added to it. Here we see the New Testament, but with a greater marvel, the marvel of Christ lifting it out of all common comparison. From beginning to end of this thoroughly accomplished study of Rest Days there is not a sentence that for a moment can be compared as a power making for progress and civilization with that one sentence, 'The Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath.'

The Scottish Liturgy and the Prayer-Book.

By the Rev. Canon J. A. MacCulloch, D.D., Bridge of Allan.

While the Church of England is still feeling its way towards Prayer-Book revision, the Episcopal Church in Scotland has made canonical a number of permissible additions to and deviations from the Service Books.[1] If none of these are of a very far-reaching nature—*e.g.* the *Quicunque Vult* is left severely alone—they are all such as are most welcome, and most of the additions will help to enrich the Service Books of the Scottish Church. Most notable of all, perhaps, is the alternative selection of Psalms for use on certain days. This will relieve the consciences of those who find the imprecatory Psalms unsuited to congregational use. Additional proper Psalms and Lessons are supplied for various Sundays, Holy Days, and Saints' Days, but here it is a pity that alternative lessons from the Old Testament were not allowed, *e.g.*, for Palm Sunday. One would like to read the prophecy of Zechariah with its symbolic application to our Lord on that day rather than an account of the plagues of Egypt. At Morning and Evening Prayer, opening sentences are provided for the greater Festivals, and there is a comprehensive prayer for the King and the Royal Family, the Ministers of the Crown, and the High Court of Parliament. In the Litany there are several very welcome additional suffrages for missions, for Parliament, and for the King's forces, but no attempt is made to alter the language of some of the existing suffrages. Prayer must still be made for the Lords of the Council, but who are they?

In the office for Holy Communion some new Proper Prefaces—for Epiphany, the Festivals of the Virgin, of Apostles and Evangelists, for All Saints' Day, the last a very beautiful one, and for other occasions—are provided. The summary of the Law may be said instead of the Ten Commandments, though the latter must still be said once a month at least. After offering the Elements, the sentences from 1 Ch $29^{11.14}$ may be said, these following the Authorized Version, not the more rhythmical form in the Scottish Communion Office. Passing over the variations in most of the minor offices, of which those in the office for Holy Matrimony will be generally acceptable, the next most important changes are found in the office for the Burial of the Dead. Here are many alternative lessons, the permissible use of other existing collects, a prayer for the mourners (and all who have used the office must have felt how much such a prayer was required), and an alternative form of committal. There are also some excellent variations for use at the burial of little children, as well as a form of benediction of a grave.

Amongst the additions are many useful occasional prayers, and, besides the Bidding Prayer, there are additional collects for the greater sacred seasons, as well as two prayers, one of great beauty from the Book of Deer, and one from the Altus of S. Columba. Collects, Epistles, and Gospels are supplied for the festival of the Transfiguration, the Days of SS. Kentigern, Patrick, Columba, Ninian, and Margaret, the

[1] *Permissible Additions to and Deviations from the Service Books of the Scottish Church as Canonically Sanctioned.* Cambridge: At the University Press. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 100 Princes Street.

Ember Days, Harvest Thanksgivings, and Dedication festivals, and for use at the Solemnization of Matrimony and the Burial of the Dead.

While it is true that the composing of a collect is a lost art—for who can hope to emulate the rhythm and nervous prose of the Latin collects or of their sixteenth and seventeenth century renderings?—the new prayers are always dignified and worthy of the occasions of their use, though sometimes they are lacking in that rhythm which makes the existing prayers in the Service Books fall so easily from the mouth of him who utters them. And in the gain of elasticity, of variety, of appropriate recognition of modern needs, one feels that the Scottish Church has acted wisely in putting forth these Permissible Additions to and Deviations from the Service Books, even if this title is ungainly and awkward. It should be added, however, that these new matters are strictly optional; no one is forced to use all or any of them.

As to the Scottish Liturgy[1] itself, that is to say, the office for administration of Holy Communion, which has been native to the Scottish Church since 1764, and which is the envy of all liturgiologists in the sister Church across the border, there is furnished for the first time an authorized and canonical *textus receptus*, while it may be said that the office is now set by the new Canons on a more worthy footing than before. The chief differences between this and the earlier editions are the careful revision and elaboration of rubrics, the alternative of 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' etc., on weekdays instead of the Commandments or the Summary, the omission of the Collect for the King except on special occasions, the addition of all the permissible additional collects of the other Communion Office, and, what is the crux of the whole revision, the alteration and amplification of the Prayer of Invocation. It is for this more than anything else that those who loved the unrevised office for itself, concise and startling as the words of its Invocation may have been, and for its historical associations as the Communion Office composed in days of persecution and endeared to the Jacobite Churchfolk of the eighteenth century, will not be enamoured of the new Liturgy. The new Invocation is excellent in itself, but it is new! It is true they are not bound to use it and that there were good reasons for the change, yet it is surprising how people who have been accustomed to a certain form of words resent any change. This applies to the deviations from the other offices also, as it doubtless also applied to the successive revisions of the Prayer-Book centuries ago, and to the Authorized Version of the Bible when it was first used.

The Liturgy and the Deviations are beautifully printed and published by the Cambridge University Press, and may be had either separately or together in a variety of forms from 1d. upwards. A Scottish Prayer-Book embodying all the new and revised materials is promised from the same Press in the autumn.

[1] *The Scottish Liturgy for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist and Administration of Holy Communion, commonly called the Scottish Communion Office.* Cambridge: At the University Press. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press, 100 Princes Street.

Contributions and Comments.

The Fate of the Traitor.

In the interesting note on 'The Fate of the Traitor' by Dr. Nestle in the April issue of The Expository Times, I observe that the learned Professor of Maulbronn does not refer to an account said to have come from Papias, that Judas was crushed to death by a waggon in a narrow lane. What trustworthy evidence is available for the assumption of Papias that is evidently not accepted by Dr. Nestle and other scholars and commentators?

F. R. Whittaker.

The Parsonage, Baldwin, Isle of Man.

'Those Holy Mountains.'

We are so accustomed to 'the *holy* mountains' in Ps 87^1, that no commentary as yet seems to have called attention to the fact that the Targum presupposes the reading 'the *ancient* mountains,' in agreement with Is 33^{15} (קדם instead of קדש, one letter different). For הררי (mountains) the Targum reads הוֹרי (fathers, after Gn 49^{26}). A plurality of holy mountains is surprising; the reading of the Targum seems to me better. On a possible connexion of the taxing or enrolment in Lk 2 with v.[6] of this Psalm, see a note in the *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xi. 1910, p. 89.

Eb. Nestle.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

Recent Poetry.

'In all their affliction he was afflicted.' So is it with the Redeemer; so is it with every one of the redeemed. There is a poem called 'The Beggars,' in *Poems of Revolt*, by G. Constant Lounsbery (Gay & Hancock; 3s. 6d. net), which illustrates the text—

Sordid stroller of the street,
Eyes of hunger, shuffling feet,
What have I to do with thee
And thy trailing misery—?

Take this pittance, turn away,
Go thy aimless, angry way,
Dull resentment in thy mind
Smouldering against mankind.

Why, within my secret room,
Through the softly-scented gloom,
By the fireside's glint and glow,
Steals the vision of thy woe?

Say what wrong did I to thee
To endure thy misery?

Who art thou, and who am I?
Does some deep affinity
Bid me hear thy baffled cry,
Smite me with thine agony?

Not the very lips of love,
Murmuring, are heard above
That wild weeping in the night,
Shivering our vain delight.

I beseech thee, take from me
Thy intruding misery!

Thou hast stricken my content,
Joy before thee steals away
Happiness, the heaven sent,
Hungering is held at bay.

Wreck of wandering weariness,
Mine, the blight of thy distress
Turning here, and turning there,
I behold thee everywhere!

Lift thy curse, the curse from me,
Beggar, of thy misery!

Hollow, haggard, in the glass
Thy face is my face, alas!
Beggar, thou art one with me,
One with my humanity—!

In Eliza Duncan Percy's *Poems of Faith and Hope* (Kelly; 1s. net) there is a short poem entitled 'Luke'—

Another tide and a darker night—
He comes, who came on the midnight sea
To the fishermen of Galilee,
A voice of comfort—a form of light.
By the lonely traveller, sore dismayed,
The voice of the Son of God who died,
Is heard, 'It is I, be not afraid!'
And the boat is at the other side.

There is a frank worldliness (not, of course, in the commercial sense) in Mr. H. W. Garrod's *Oxford Poems* (John Lane; 3s. 6d. net) which will make them acceptable wherever young men have tasted of the joy of life. But sometimes a deeper sentiment is felt, as in this intimation of immortality—

If man from empty shadows born
A shadow passes whence he came,
I know not: but I know each morn
The blood within me saith 'I am':

And something laughs and leaps and longs,
And dashes at the hill of life,
And dies for honour's fancied wrongs,
And strives for very love of strife;

And out of dull disaster gains
The strength that hopeless causes give,
And out of death's subduing pains
Cries 'Dying, and behold we live.'

Messrs. Longmans have published a cheap and very attractive edition of Newman's *Verses on Various Occasions* (2s. net). It includes 'The Dream of Gerontius.'

We are almost as much ashamed in these days of the display of an emotion as we are of the cross of Christ. Even our poetry is losing by its reticence. We ought to be able to combine

frankness with reserve. Mr. Gilbert Thomas dedicates *Birds of Passage and Other Verses* (Chapman & Hall; 2s. 6d. net) to his mother and is not ashamed of it. But the dedication has the proper note of reserve.

> We cannot speak the things we feel.
> How should the inmost soul reveal
> Its inmost passion, thro' a word
> By unseen listeners overheard?
> I simply write your name above—
> For silence is the eloquence of love.

The book is altogether above the average of fugitive poetry—the most poetical of this month's issue.

To *Some Poems of Lionel Johnson* (Elkin Mathews; 1s. net) a short memoir has been prefixed which was contributed to the *Atlantic Monthly* in 1902 by Louise Imogen Guiney. To her Johnson seemed to be a typical Oxonian, tolerant of many things, intolerant only of the 'foggy' Teutonic intellect. Take this on

THE PRECEPT OF SILENCE.

> I know you: solitary griefs,
> Desolate passions, aching hours!
> I know you: tremulous beliefs,
> Agonised hopes, and ashen flowers!
>
> The winds are sometimes sad to me;
> The starry spaces full of fear;
> Mine is the sorrow on the sea,
> And mine the sigh of places drear.
>
> Some players upon plaintive strings
> Publish their wistfulness abroad:
> I have not spoken of these things,
> Save to one man, and unto God.

Illustrations.

A volume is offered for the best illustration of any of the following texts in St. John's Gospel—13^{10} 13^{34} 14^{1} 14^{2} 14^{6} $14^{15\text{-}17}$ 14^{23} 14^{26} 14^{27} 15^{1} 15^{4} 16^{7} $16^{8\text{-}11}$ 16^{13} 16^{23} 17^{3} 17^{15} 17^{19} $18^{37.\ 38}$ 20^{17} $20^{19.\ 20}$ 20^{23} 20^{28} 20^{29} $21^{15\text{-}17}$ 21^{22}.

Also for the best illustration of any of the following texts—James 1^{17} 5^{16}, 1 Peter 1^{3} 1^{8} 1^{12} 2^{5} 2^{21} 2^{24} 3^{15} $3^{18\text{-}20}$ 5^{7}, 2 Peter $1^{5\text{-}7}$ 3^{13} 3^{18}, 1 John 1^{5} 1^{7} $1^{8.\ 9}$ 2^{1} 3^{1} 3^{2} 3^{3} 4^{7} 4^{8} 4^{16} 4^{18} 4^{19} 5^{4} 5^{21}, Jude $^{20\text{-}21}$.

Those who are successful may choose two volumes from the 'Great Texts' or the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or one volume from the 'International Critical Commentary' or the 'International Theological Library.' Ten volumes will be given in all.

The illustrations must be received by the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, by the end of July 1912.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by Principal S. S. Thomas, Baptist Institute, Delhi.

Illustrations for the Great Text for August must be received by the 1st of July. The text is 2 Ch 25^{2}.

The Great Text for September is 1 Co 4^{5}—'Wherefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God.' A copy of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for October is 1 Co 15^{58}—'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts' or of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for November is Ro 15^{13}—'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.' A copy of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or of Lewis's *Philocalia of Origen*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for December is Jn 6^{35}—'Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' A copy of Welch's *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*, or of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Gem's *An Anglo-Saxon Abbot*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'A Bible has immense advantages for those who can use it, but for the world at large it has its dangers.'

The sentence occurs in *The Greek Genius and its Meaning to us*, a book written by Mr. R. W. Livingstone, Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and published at the Clarendon Press (6s. net). At the moment Mr. Livingstone is dealing with freedom of speech, which he recognizes as one of the elements of the Greek genius. The Greeks, he tells us, enjoyed freedom of speech beyond all other nations that have ever appeared upon the earth. And one of the reasons why they had such a unique enjoyment of freedom of speech was that they possessed no Bible. For 'a Bible has immense advantages for those who can use it, but for the world at large it has its dangers.'

Why should the Bible restrain freedom of speech? Mr. Livingstone does not tell us why it should do so; he tells us only that it does so. He answers our question by a historical example. It is the old and familiar example of Galileo. Mr. Livingstone tells the story over again in this way: 'The Psalmist had said that the sun "runneth about from one end of heaven to the other," and that "the foundations of the round world are so firmly fixed that they cannot be moved." How then could Galileo maintain that the earth moves about the sun?' Thus the Bible restrained Galileo's freedom of speech.

It was a mistaken use to make of the Bible. We admit it. We have admitted it for a long time. And if a single example can prove a proposition, then for the world at large the Bible has its dangers. And so the question comes to be this: Is it better to have no Bible at all than to have a Bible which may be used to restrain our freedom of speech?

If we have no Bible, what then? Then, says Mr. Livingstone, we have no God. That is to say, we have no God worth calling God; we have no God that we can worship. It was his Bible, he says, that gave the Jew his God. The Greek, having no Bible, 'thought his gods out.' And even Mr. Livingstone, with all his affection for the Greeks, and with all his aversion to the Jews, admits that no man can truly worship a god whom he himself has thought out.

Well, the day is at hand when it will become necessary for every one of us to make up our minds whether, to use Mr. Livingstone's language, we are to be Jews with a Bible or Greeks without one. The Greek takes a purely human attitude towards life. He assumes that man is the measure

of all things, and believes that even though the unseen may be there, still we can know our duty and live our life without reference to it. Are we to become humanists like the Greeks? 'That,' says Mr. LIVINGSTONE, 'is perhaps the biggest question of the day, the one most worth settling, the one which every man has to settle for himself.'

Now, if our minds are made up and we are to be humanists, we ought to understand that we are not making an experiment. We are humanists with our eyes open, with an understanding of what humanism can do for us. For the Greeks tried it before us, and they tried it with a wholeheartedness which can never again be surpassed in the history of the world. The Greeks lived their life in the present; they did not trouble themselves about the future. They lived among things seen; they did not concern themselves with the unseen. They said literally, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' How did they find it work?

They found it worked comparatively well while things went well with them and while they were young. The Greeks enjoyed their youth. But they did not look forward with pleasure to old age. If we may judge from Greek literature, humanists approach old age lamenting the loss of youth's capacity for action and enjoyment. When age comes they say that they

> . . . feel her slowly chilling breath invade
> The cheek grown thin, the brown hair sprent with grey;
> They feel her finger light
> Laid pausefully upon life's headlong train;—
> The foot less prompt to meet the morning dew,
> The heart less bounding at emotion new,
> And hope, once crush'd, less quick to spring again.

Nor does humanism serve better when sorrow comes. At the end of the first year of the Peloponnesian War there was a public funeral for those who had fallen, and all Athens was there to hear Pericles give the address over their graves. Before him in the crowd he could see those whose husbands, fathers, sons had fallen. What has he to say to them? What comfort can he bring? This is what he said: 'You know that your life has been passed among manifold vicissitudes; and that they may be thought fortunate who have gained most honour, whether an honourable death like your sons, or an honourable sorrow like yours. I know how hard it is to make you feel this, when the good fortune of others will too often remind you of the gladness which once lightened your hearts. The deepest sorrow is felt at the loss of blessings to which we have grown accustomed. Some of you are of an age at which they may hope to have other children, and they ought to bear their sorrow better. Not only will the children who may be born hereafter make them forget their own lost ones, but the city will be a gainer. To those of you who have passed their prime, I say: "Congratulate yourselves that you have been happy during the greater part of your days; remember that your life of sorrow will not last long, and be comforted by the glory of those who are gone. Honour is the delight of men when they are old and useless."'

Neither in the prospect of old age nor in the presence of death does it do well to ignore the unseen and the eternal. How does it work in youth and manhood? How does it work in health and prosperity? Turn to the first chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and you will find the answer. It is a chapter we have difficulty in reading now; yet no one who knows Greek or Roman literature calls it exaggerated. And what is the source of that immeasurable sewer of iniquity? The Greeks and Romans were without God and without hope in the world. And Mr. LIVINGSTONE tells us that they were without God and without hope *because they were without a Bible.*

Some account has already been given in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of Messrs. Williams &

Norgate's 'Home University Library,' the first forty volumes having been noticed in one short comprehensive article. Other ten volumes have now been published. One of them has the title of *Conservatism*. Its author is Lord Hugh Cecil, M.A., M.P. That volume should have appeared earlier, for it is No. 11 in the list. But we know that Lord Hugh Cecil has of late had much to do. The publishers were no doubt glad to receive it at any time. Readers of it will be as glad as the publishers. But before we say anything about what this volume contains, let us discharge our duty and name the authors and subjects of the other nine books of the list.

Two of them are religious—*Nonconformity*, by Principal W. B. Selbie, and *Buddhism*, by Mrs. Rhys Davids. Two belong to language and literature—*Medieval English Literature*, by Professor W. P. Ker, and *The English Language*, by Mr. L. Pearsall Smith. One is historical—*The American Civil War*, by Mr. Frederic L. Paxson, Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin. Finally, four are scientific. There is a volume on *Psychology*, by that master of sane English psychology, Mr. W. McDougall, Reader in Mental Philosophy in the University of Oxford. There is also a volume on *The Principles of Physiology*, by Emeritus-Professor McKendrick of Glasgow; there is a volume on *Matter and Energy*, by Mr. Frederick Soddy of the same University; and there is a volume on *Agriculture*, by Dr. William Somerville, Sibthorpian Professor of Rural Economy in Oxford.

These names and titles are surely attractive enough. But if not, the publishers are prepared to make them irresistible. For they offer two prizes, a first prize of twenty-five pounds and a second prize of five pounds, for the best short essay on any one or all of the ten volumes, the chief conditions being that the competitor shall be not more than twenty-five years of age on September 1, 1912, and that no essay shall exceed 2000 words. And now to Lord Hugh Cecil and Conservatism.

Lord Hugh Cecil has divided his book into two parts. Of the second part the first chapter is entitled 'Religion and Politics.' Let us turn to that chapter.

It begins with a demand for principles. Lord Hugh Cecil has much to say about principles. Instead of *Conservatism*, his book might have been called *Conservative Principles*. And he uses the word advisedly. He does not bluntly say that a politician of no principles is a politician of no principle. For he is in his study, writing calmly and courteously. But he does not hide it from us that that is his meaning. Men of Conservative principles, he says, have a standard of right and wrong to which they refer their conduct. Of men who have no such standard he would say, as emphatically as Lorenzo said of the unmusical, 'Let no such man be trusted.'

If, then, the politician must have a definite ethical standard, what is that standard? 'It needs little argument,' says Lord Hugh Cecil, 'to show that it must be that of Christian morals as revealed in the New Testament'; and he adds, 'This always has been and still is the position of all the different elements of which the modern Conservative Party is made up, and, indeed, of the vast majority of the people, to whatever political party they belong.' It is a memorable saying. What will the unbeliever make of it? If Christ is a mere man, if there is even some doubt of His earthly existence, how are we to account for the fact that twenty centuries of the history of the world have taken not one step in advance of the ethical principles which He inculcated? Here in the twentieth century is a politician—a politician, mind you, in search of a background against which to set his conduct in order that he may look at it clearly and judge it fairly—and he tells us that he can find no background comparable in elevation and integrity with the standard of righteousness contained in the Gospels.

Lord Hugh Cecil is quite well aware that there

are politicians who do not adopt that standard. 'It is true,' he says, 'that in our time there is a disposition, not very definitely formulated but increasingly powerful, to claim a right to go behind the authority of the New Testament in morals, and to supersede it in favour of some other undefined standard.' 'But,' he says, and his words are well worth attending to, 'this tendency is not yet sufficiently strong to make it needful or useful to consider it at length in this place.'

And it makes the situation not less but more surprising when we are told that the direct teaching of the New Testament on matters of State 'is slight and even meagre.' The teaching of the New Testament is occupied with principles of conduct; it does not condescend to details. Why does it not condescend? Because that would have arrested its influence as a standard of authority within the first generation or two; and so the wonder is, How did Jesus, if He was a man, and only a man, know that that rock was there? Muhammad did not know. Muhammad never dreamt of its existence, and shattered his vessel upon it.

What has the New Testament to say about matters of State? Only three things, says Lord Hugh Cecil. First, the duty of obedience to the State is enforced. Next, the separation of things spiritual and things material is taught in the memorable 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' Lastly, 'the example of patient submission even to oppression is prominent throughout.' Lord Hugh Cecil sums up the teaching of the New Testament on political matters in this statement: 'Obedience is due to the authority of the State within its own sphere, but that sphere does not extend to purely spiritual matters.'

Now that statement runs out in two directions. It runs out in the direction of what is known in Scotland as 'the Headship of Christ'; and it runs out in the direction of what is known in England as 'the Divine Right of kings.'

First, as to the Headship of Christ. It need not be said that Lord Hugh Cecil believes in an established Church. He believes in the establishment of the Church in England, and he believes in the establishment of the Church in Scotland. For he believes in 'the national affirmation of the existence of God and the moral responsibility to His judgment which attaches to men in their national, no less than in their individual acts'; and he does not see how that 'national affirmation' can exist apart from establishment. It must be confessed, however, that he does not make it quite clear what he means by establishment. It has nothing to do with endowment. For he discusses disestablishment and disendowment separately. What then, apart from endowment, is establishment? He says that establishment is necessary to the national recognition of religion, but he does not say in what ways, apart from endowment, religion may be nationally recognized.

On the Divine Right of kings Lord Hugh Cecil has less to say, and he says it more effectively. He has no doubt whatever that tyranny justifies resistance; it is recognized, he says, on all hands. And he claims for himself the right, as he concedes the right to every other person, to say what tyranny is. 'Within very recent years two important cases of actual resistance to the law have arisen, and a third still more important may arise in the near future. Nonconformists have refused payment of the education rate on the ground that it is inconsistent with their convictions to pay it; advocates of Women's Suffrage have riotously approached Parliament, have assaulted the police and used other acts of violence in order to bring home to public opinion the reality of their claim for votes for women; and the inhabitants of Belfast and the surrounding districts who are opposed to Home Rule have announced that in all the circumstances of the case they cannot consent to be placed under the government of

a National Parliament in Ireland, and that they are prepared for a temporary separation rather than consent to such submission.'

Lord Hugh Cecil has nothing with which to reproach the Nonconformists who refuse payment of the education rate. He has no fault to find with the advocates of Women's Suffrage who approached Parliament even although they did it riotously and assaulted the police. And it is evident that he thinks the inhabitants of Belfast will be within their right should they take measures for a temporary separation rather than submit to a Nationalist Parliament in Ireland. 'Cases of resistance,' he says, 'are likely to become more and more common. Nor are Conservatives better guides in this perplexity than Radicals. The most that can be said is that, on the whole, Conservatives would lean rather more to the side of authority than Radicals, although, as the case of Ireland shows, circumstances might arise strong enough to produce a reversal in the attitude of the two parties.'

Is the Old Testament worth presenting to the young? That question stood as the title of one of the papers read at a conference which was held in Cambridge in April 1912. The papers read at the Conference, edited by the Rev. N. P. Wood, M.A., B.D., have been gathered into a thin volume and published at the Cambridge Press under the general title of *Scripture Teaching in Secondary Schools* (1s. 6d. net). It is the Rev. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., Dean of Jesus College, who asks this question, 'Is the Old Testament worth presenting to the Young?'

Why is such a question asked? It is asked because of the difficulties that lie in the way of presenting the Old Testament to the young. There are four kinds of difficulties. They may be called moral, scientific, critical, and historical.

Dr. Foakes-Jackson puts the moral difficulty in this way. He says that even in its highest aspect the morality inculcated in the Old Testament generally needs some qualification; almost every precept requires the 'But I say unto you' of Christ. Is it expedient, then, to begin with the Old Testament in giving instruction to the young? Is it expedient to include it in their curriculum at all?

The scientific difficulty is more evident. It begins with the first chapter of the first book of the Old Testament; and it is at least as serious there as it is anywhere else. Have we not, says Dr. Foakes-Jackson, to teach one thing in the geography lesson and another when we turn to the Book of Genesis? Is not most of the Old Testament built on absolutely false suppositions in regard to every discovery in science since the close of the Middle Ages? And the question is, Are we justified in troubling young people with early beliefs and guesses about the universe now demonstrably false?

The third difficulty is concerned with criticism. To the average conscientious teacher it is the greatest difficulty of all, and the most pressing. He believes it is the origin of all the rest of the difficulties. How easy it was once to teach such stories as Jacob's flight, Joseph and his brethren, or the Exodus, when you made a straightforward narrative out of your Bible. How difficult it is to teach these stories now. 'We are taught,' says Dean Foakes-Jackson, 'that there are three main stories of Jacob, each subdivided into contributions by different hands. How am I to explain that this patchwork narrative of one who is in one place a tribe and in another a tribal God, and only occasionally an individual, has a history worth any attention from a seeker after moral truth? It was easy formerly to see in Joseph an example of probity and virtue, of love of home and magnanimity, and to tell children how he, the favourite, was sold as a slave, and by his honesty and wisdom rose to be the chief man in Egypt, and the saviour of his brethren. But how are we to deal with him if Joseph is only a Rachel tribe, the story of his

temptation a popular Egyptian narrative, and his reconciliation to his brethren a treaty related in poetic form? Even if we do tell the story as it appears in Genesis, are we justified in ignoring J, E, and P, and all their manifold combinations? And as frankness would only end in boring and mystifying the children—surely it is better not to trouble them at all?'

The last difficulty is historical. A large part of the Old Testament is historical. Let us leave the early narratives of Genesis alone, says the distracted teacher, and let us teach the history that is in the historical books. But is it history? Are not the facts frequently subordinated to purposes of edification? Have the Old Testament historians any real conception of what we mean by history? The historians of the Old Testament are as often poets or prophets as they are historians. And the more prophetical they are, and even the more poetical, the more are they satisfied that they are fulfilling the purposes of true history. 'To tell a boy that the historical books of the Old Testament contain a record which satisfies our ideas of history is to put him off the track altogether.'

Is the Old Testament worth presenting to the young, then? Dr. Foakes-Jackson believes that it is well worth. He believes that it is the more worth for the very reason that these difficulties are in the way.

For in the first place he holds it to be undeniable that the purpose of the Old Testament is throughout moral. It teaches morality, and it teaches it deliberately. In Greek or Roman history when we hear of a great man perishing miserably we are simply pained; but the fate of Saul moves us to indignation because we consider he did not deserve it. This difference of feeling is due to the fact that in dealing with the history of other nations we are satisfied with events; when we turn to the history of Israel we look for their moral interpretation. It may be quite true that the morality of the Old Testament is elementary. Dr. Foakes-Jackson holds that it is the better suited to the young. Moral consciousness among men is a matter of development. Let boys begin with the morality of the Old Testament and they will come in time to appreciate and practise the morality of the New.

With the second difficulty, the antagonism between the Old Testament and elementary truths in science and geography, Dr. Foakes-Jackson is not greatly concerned. It is a difficulty that was formidable forty years ago; it is not formidable now. There was a time when it was supposed that the first chapter of Genesis must be confirmed by modern geology, or one or the other must go. That does not seem now to be felt, either by the scientist or the defender of Christianity. And all that the teacher has now to do is plainly to tell the class that the ancient Hebrews did not and could not possibly know what a later age has discovered, and that their ignorance on these points does not detract from the value of what they have to teach us on others.

But when he comes to criticism he comes to a subject of real difficulty. He seems to think, however, that much of the difficulty is due to the average teacher's ignorance of what criticism is, and what is the difference it has made to the teaching of the Old Testament. So he begins by telling us what are the general results of Old Testament criticism. He sets them down in the following six short statements:—

1. The Old Testament is a collection of documents of different periods put together in their present form at a comparatively late date, say, between B.C. 500 and 160.

2. What we call the Law of Moses contains the chief ritual, dietary and ceremonial Laws, together with the arrangements for the worship of Jehovah from the latest collection of Laws.

3. There is a primitive history, if not histories, of Israel, and a later one coloured by the presupposition that the priestly law was in force from an early time.

4. The most valuable contemporary evidence we have is to be found in the utterances of the prophets.

5. We are not on anything approaching solid ground till we reach the ninth century B.C., when Israel is brought into contact with Assyria; and before (say) David, we have to rely mainly on tradition for information about Israel.

6. The religion of Israel before the appearance of the literary prophets approximated more to that of the kindred nations than was generally supposed.

Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON does not claim that all these things are proved. He claims only that they are 'fairly generally' accepted. On the assumption that they are true he proceeds to discuss how the Old Testament may be presented to the young. Now he has no sympathy with the teacher, or, we suppose, with the preacher, who boasts that on all occasions and under all circumstances he is prepared to tell the whole truth, though he certainly has no sympathy with the other type of teacher who is prepared to tell what he believes not to be true. He holds that it is a mistake for any teacher of the young, and, for that matter, of the old as well as the young, in teaching what he calls the whole truth, to blurt out views and theories which lead to a completely mistaken view of the matter.

Suppose he has to teach the Book of Genesis. He finds certain things in it which he cannot teach literally as facts. Again, he finds statements about the miraculous which he has difficulty in accepting. And in the third place he has to face certain critical views and theories. As regards the facts, he believes that he must be perfectly frank, especially when they conflict with scientific or historical truth. In respect to the miracles more caution is necessary. Yet the miracles of the Old Testament are less difficult than those of the New, and less depends upon them. Still he holds that the utmost caution is necessary in order that the teacher may avoid such pitfalls as the vague assertion that miracles do not happen. Whether miracles happen or not is a philosophical, not a scientific question, and science must never be confounded with philosophy.

But the real difficulty is again with the critical theories. His method is to trouble none but the very best students with problems concerning sources. Nor does he think it desirable to say much even to them on these topics until they are in fair possession of the main facts of the Biblical story, and have also learned how to use them for their profit. 'For,' he says, 'the Bible is not merely a literary puzzle. If it were that, it would have been dropped long ago. It is God's message to His people, and when it ceases to be that, it is of little value to any one.'

And so Dean FOAKES-JACKSON comes to the last of all the difficulties which the teacher of the Old Testament has to deal with. Is the Old Testament history, or is it not? He believes that it is very much nearer true history than we are now in the habit of thinking. He takes the references in the Old Testament to warfare. He points out that not in a single instance does an Israelite judge or king use horses before the days of Solomon. The enemies of Israel have chariots and horsemen, but Israel never. The Canaanites from the earliest times have chariots of iron. The Philistines on Mount Gilboa press Saul hard with their chariots and horsemen. Yet not even David with all his prowess is said to have possessed cavalry. Never to have fallen into inconsistency on such a point as this is evidence to Dr. FOAKES-JACKSON that the Old Testament writers have claim to be considered historians.

In conclusion—but let us quote his words: 'In conclusion,' he says, 'I would make an earnest plea for the retention of the study of the Old Testament. We may feel the difficulties of teaching it keenly: but we hardly realise what we should lose by abandoning it. We should give up an appeal to the interest of the young which we could ill afford

to lose; for the stories of the Old Testament stir the imagination as nothing else in the world can do. We should give up that connexion with the ideas and feelings of the East which have so much to contribute to the right understanding of the Christian faith. Above all, we should surrender the very key to the revelation of the New Testament, which was, and is, and always must be based upon the right understanding of the books of the Old Testament.'

The Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul.

By the Rev. C. Anderson Scott, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Westminster College, Cambridge.

An examination of the dualistic element in the thinking of St. Paul seems to be called for, in view of the double fact that it has very important bearing on the exegesis of several passages in the Epistles as well as on the theology of the Apostle in general, and that at the same time it has received quite inadequate recognition and treatment. The most cursory examination of the current handbooks and treatises on Paul and the Pauline theology will show how little place and weight are given to this element in his thought. And if some are prepared to say that it is overlooked because it is not there, they have good authority for their opinion. It will suffice to turn to the index to Professor H. A. A. Kennedy's valuable work on *St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things*, where we find this entry: 'Dualism, no trace of, in Paul.' In the text to which the index refers we find something not quite so sweeping: (p. 146) 'We see nothing in his writings to justify the hypothesis so frequently charged upon him, that he took a dualistic view of human nature'; (p. 329) 'It is altogether groundless to rear on this foundation the theory of a cosmic dualism in St. Paul.' With both of these statements we may heartily agree, and yet demur strongly to the opinion that there is 'no trace of dualism in St. Paul.'

For, quite apart from a 'cosmic dualism' or a 'dualistic view of human nature,' there is a dualism which consists in the recognition, whether in theory or practice, of a power or powers other than God, external to man, exerting influence over human affairs, and in some sense or degree independent of God. This definition is purposely made very wide: for there are many forms or grades of this dualism, each affecting a man's thinking in a different way. We have to ascertain what traces there may be of dualism of any kind, and to estimate its character and its influence on the thinking of St. Paul.

Before examining the evidence of the Apostle's own letters, it will be well to mark the antecedent probability that he held a dualistic view of life; in other words, that there were certain sides of life, certain experiences which he interpreted by referring them to the action and influence of powers which were in some sense independent of, and even hostile to, God. The probability is very strong. Indeed, if Paul did not hold some such view, he would be at variance with the universal opinion of his time. For dualism was one of the three new factors which make their appearance in the later stage of the Old Testament history, and specially after the exile, Individualism, Dualism, and Pessimism. These three are closely connected, and together go far to account for the too long unrecognized gulf between 'Hebrew' and 'Jewish' thought.

The optimism regarding the future, which was the essence of the Messianic hope in all its forms, was simply the counterpart of a pessimism regarding the present which laid increasing hold on the Jewish mind. And this pessimism partly grew out of, and partly fostered, a dualistic view of things. But that view was religious, not philosophic, in its origin. The very intensity of men's belief in God led them, when faced by the hopeless situation of His people, to postulate a source for their present experience other than God. Because they despaired of the world that now is, they looked with increasing wistfulness for a world or age to come, a new heaven and a new earth. And they found a justification for their despair, as well as an

explanation of their experience, in the view that the present world or age had fallen under the dominion of an evil power. In the later canonical and the inter-canonical literature the pictures and predictions due to the old prophets are reproduced indeed, but on a new plane. The old world and the old nation are no longer regarded as furnishing a sphere for the Divine redemption. The contrast between present and future in this world undergoes the supremely significant change into a contrast between this world or age and the world or age to come. And all hope is projected beyond a crisis of Divine interference. The situation is well summarized by Hollmann: 'If we compare the apocalyptic with the older Jewish views, even those of the earliest post-exilic period, the most important difference that confronts us is the dualism of the Apocalyptic theory of the world. It is the most decisive characteristic of this class of literature, a new trait foreign to Judaism. The present world is bad, the prey of Satan and the demons, given over to irremediable destruction. . . . No doubt there always existed in the Jewish religion, as in all popular religions and even in the prophetic period, a belief in evil, uncanny spectres, and goblins. What is new in the apocalyptic is the remarkable prominence of this belief, and the consolidation of all these beings to a kingdom of evil under a monarchical government.'[1] And, in fact, the Messiah of Apocalyptic literature, so far as he appears at all, is really a dualistic figure. His appearance is called for by the fact that the world κεῖται ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ: he is the vice-gerent of God, sent to give battle not to earthly tyrants, but to Satan and the spiritual hosts of evil.

It is, of course, impossible to say that the point of view found in this Apocalyptic literature was characteristic of all sections of the Jewish people, *e.g.* in the time of Paul. The Sadducees doubtless, who denied the existence of angels or spirits, would necessarily be excluded from it. But there can be no doubt that for the bulk of the people it formed the background of religion; and the probability is great that it would colour the earliest impressions on the mind of Saul of Tarsus.

This *a priori* probability might be challenged from two sides. It might be argued, as it is probably taken for granted by many, that St. Paul, when he became a Christian, started with a *tabula rasa* for a mind: that though this might be the view of the world held by him before his conversion, that has no bearing on the question of his subsequent opinions. But such a position becomes untenable in the light of any thorough research. The evidence is too copious and too strong which points to the persistence after his conversion alike of conceptions and of habits of thought which belonged to his Jewish atmosphere and upbringing. We see in the Epistles the utterance of living thought in which both old and new elements of consciousness are intermingled, the new sometimes overcoming and excluding the old, sometimes coalescing with it; and the fascinating task of the student is to apply a kind of qualitative analysis, to discover what elements are present in their traditional form, what others are wholly new, and what others again have been 'altered' by the irruptive forces of Christian experience.

It might be argued, more plausibly perhaps, that the Apocalyptic literature from which we derive much evidence and many details of this dualistic conception belongs to, and represents, only a section of Jewish society, and that possibly Paul belonged to another section and was unaffected by it. It is true that the strictly legal Rabbinic schools rejected the Apocalypses; but that was not till after A.D. 70. And the fact that formal repudiation was necessary may be said to point to a period when they had been widely accepted. 'It is incorrect,' says Hollmann, 'to regard the Apocalyptic literature as a sort of heretical backwater of legal Judaism, though Jewish scholars are apt to take this view. In the writings themselves there is no trace of anything of the kind. The volume of this literature and the fact that the Christians simply took over the Apocalypses, and wrote similar works themselves, tells strongly against such a notion.' And as regards belief in a spirit-world among the Pharisees to whom Paul belonged, we have emphatic testimony in the Acts that they believed both in angels and in spirits (23[8]).

There seems, therefore, no sufficient ground to doubt the antecedent probability that Paul shared the prevailing dualistic views of his time, as they are generally represented in the literature which has survived. But such *a priori* considerations

[1] Hollmann, *Jewish Religion in the Time of Christ*, Eng. tr. p. 103 ff.; cf. also Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, pp. 7, 60; and Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 239.

are possibly redundant in view of the clear evidence of his own writings.

In the first place, Paul makes that sharp distinction between the two worlds or ages which is the sign-manual of the Apocalyptic point of view. The wisdom that he speaks is not the wisdom 'of this age,' but the wisdom of God (2 Co 2^6): he describes the effect of the work of Christ as the deliverance of believers 'out of this present evil age' (Gal 1^4), and charges them not to be conformed to 'this age' (Ro 12^2). When he describes the condition of those who did not know Christ as that of men living under the power of darkness (Col 1^{13}), or themselves as 'darkness,' when, on the other hand, he addresses Christians as 'children of light,' he is speaking in terms which have their source in Apocalyptic dualism, such as we find, *e.g.*, in Enoch (41^8), 'The Lord who made a separation between light and darkness and divided the spirits of men'; (108^{11}) 'The spirits of the good who belong to the generation of light.'

In the second place, he recognizes that of these two ages the one that now is, is in some sense and degree under the dominion of powers hostile alike to God and to man. These are represented sometimes as a host or hierarchy of numerous grades, sometimes as concentrated under or in a single individual. To this individual various names and descriptions are given. Some ten or eleven times Paul refers to this power under the name of 'Satan,' and once as 'Beliar': for descriptive epithets he uses ὁ πονηρός, and ὁ πειράζων. As to the name 'Satan,' what is important to observe is that St. Paul's Satan is not just the Satan of the Old Testament, even of its latest stratum. Rather does the figure include the conception of the Power of Evil as developed during the intercanonical period. In his *Introduction to the Book of Job*, Dr. A. B. Davidson gave us what might be called a history of Satan, beginning with the unnamed spirit of 1 K 22^{19}, and passing through the representation in Job to that in Zechariah. 'In the prophet the Satan appears in somewhat darker colours and in somewhat stronger opposition to the merciful purposes of God in regard to men; hence, while in Job he is merely reproached by God for setting Him on against His servant, he is rebuked in Zechariah. We must be careful not to impose on the Book of Job, or even on this prophet, conceptions which belong to a more advanced period. The Satan of these books is no mere "evil spirit," the real enemy of God though His unwilling subject. There is no antagonism between God and the Satan. The Satan in Job is the servant of God represented as carrying out His trying, sifting process, and the opposer of men because he is the minister of God.'

It is a very different conception of Satan which meets us in the Pauline Epistles, and indeed in the New Testament in general. He *is* the enemy of God, and exercises other than a merely delegated authority over men. Again, we find the earliest traces of the new conception in the Apocalypses. Under one of many names, such as Mastema, Azazel, or Semjaza, there appears there an independent power of evil, head of a world of evil spirits, the determined foe of God and man. 'In the New Testament period the figure of the Devil is a settled factor of popular belief.' That belief St. Paul shows no signs of repudiating or criticising: yet it is remarkable, as Bousset has pointed out,[1] that his references to Satan under that name are comparatively few, and of these several have a perfunctory sound, that is to say, he seems to use the name in an unreflecting popular way, as, *e.g.*, when he says: 'Satan hindered us,' 'certain have turned aside after Satan.' A greater sense of Satan's reality and independent power seems to underlie the two passages where he claims authority to deliver over an offender to Satan. And yet that one of these two passages which give fullest expression to his thought (1 Co 5^5) reveals, when closely examined, an unexpected approximation to the Old Testament point of view. Such an one is to be delivered over to Satan unto the destruction of the flesh, in order that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord. The punishment to be inflicted by Satan, however it is to be understood, is disciplinary: it has for its end and purpose the saving of the spirit. So that we have a close parallel to the thought in 1 Co 11^{32}: κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου παιδευόμεθα ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. Here sickness, disease, and death are the punishments inflicted upon the community which celebrates the Lord's Supper 'unworthily'; but again the purpose is disciplinary, that they may not be condemned together with the world, *i.e.* that they may be saved. The difficulty of the earlier passage is largely met if we recognize that

[1] Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 330.

Paul is there regarding Satan as the agent of the Divine discipline.

But while the ideas underlying the Apostle's use of 'Satan' seem to affiliate rather with the figure of the Old Testament, it is otherwise with that class of passages of which we find the type in 2 Co 4^4: ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων. The full significance of this phrase must not be minimized, as is done by many commentators, by urging, *e.g.*, that 'Satan is only the God of this world . . . because worldliness makes him its god.' This would still leave open the possibility that for Paul and his contemporaries this power had a very real and objective existence and authority; but it is inconsistent with the direct initiative here ascribed to the God of this world or age. He 'hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving,' and modern commentators, almost without exception, recognize here a dualistic element in the thinking of St. Paul. Volz[1] maintains that the phrase goes in this direction beyond anything that can be produced from Jewish theology, and adds that 'a comparison between Jewish literature and the New Testament on this point shows that the dualism of the New Testament is sharper than that of contemporary Judaism.' If this is so, the explanation may be found partly in the fact that in the New Testament more than elsewhere we are confronted with the ideas of the people rather than the learned, and partly by the reflex influence of a Divine Personality manifested in Jesus: this may well have led to a new emphasis on the person and character of the Power hostile to God.[2]

The striking phrase in Eph 2^2, 'the prince of the power (or, powers) of the air,' furnishes a bridge by which we pass from illustrating Paul's conception of evil as concentrated in an individual to his conception of it as distributed among a host or hierarchy of spiritual forces. For the word translated 'power' is a collective noun, and might be rendered 'powers'; and the fact that 'the air' is assigned as their abode gives a clue to their character. Apocalyptic literature throws useful light on the meaning of this phrase. It bears witness to the fact that whereas we think of one 'heaven,' a place of homogeneous experience, the special dwelling-place of God, and the final home of His people, the view widely held among the Jews of Paul's time was that there were several 'heavens,' of which only the highest was the abode of the Great Glory. The lowest, on the other hand, was occupied by the two hundred rulers of the stars, and the lowest heaven but one by the angels who had apostatized from the Lord.[3] Below the lowest heaven was the air, and that, according to a still widespread belief, was the abode of demons and of evil spirits, over which Satan ruled as prince.[4] The Testament of Levi, again, gives us a catalogue of the seven heavens, and places in the third beings who are described as 'thrones and powers,' while others of the heavens are made the abode of angels of divers kinds and functions.

This conception, so unfamiliar to us, throws light on several important passages in the Epistles. First, let us take the Angels. St. Paul had a poor opinion of angels. That may seem somewhat startling: yet it is true, and to bear it in mind helps to clear some difficulties. The Bible, as a whole, lends little countenance to the conception of angels which plays no inconsiderable part in our popular religion, and is reflected both in our stained-glass windows and in many of our hymns. The Old Testament adheres very closely to the conception of an angel as a messenger from God, without any distinctive ethical character of his own, but deriving his quality of good or bad from the nature of the errand on which he is sent. An 'evil angel' is an emissary of God sent upon an errand of judgment.[5]

But it is not the angels of the Old Testament whom St. Paul has in mind. During the Interval a change of great significance has passed over the prevalent conception regarding such beings. To whatever cause or source this change may be due, its effect was to assign to angels a new independence and initiative, the exercise of power apart from the direct mandate of God, and to many of them a fixed attitude of hostility to God which reacted on the fortunes of men. A further change is seen in the habit of classifying them according to character as good angels or bad, and according

[1] Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie*, p. 81.

[2] See Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, pp. 2, 209 ff.

[3] So in the *Slavonic Secrets of Enoch*; see esp. Dr. Charles' edition, p. xxxi ff.

[4] Cf. Test. Benj., τὸ ἀέριον πνεῦμα βελιαρ; and see Everling, p. 109.

[5] See A. B. Davidson, in Hastings' *B.D.* i. 96, art. 'Angels.'

to rank under such titles as lordships, principalities, powers, or thrones.[1] St. Paul does not press the classification of angels according to character. When he thinks of an angel as belonging to one class or other, he speaks of him either as 'an angel of light' or 'an angel of Satan.' Neither does he show any interest in the question which so fascinated some of the Apocalyptic writers, concerning the 'fallen angels' and the manner of their fall. To put it very briefly, the apostle seems to regard the spirit world as morally very much in the same condition as the world of men; but most of his references are to angels regarded as spiritual forces not on the side of God.

1. If we collect the more significant passages, we find that the intervention of angels even in a good work, reduces its value. This appears to be the idea lying at the back of the sentence in Galatians (2^{19}) as to the giving of the Law. It was διαταγεὶς δὶ ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου, and that marked its inferior or transitory character. St. Paul is comparing the promise given to Abraham with the Law ordained through Moses, with the purpose of showing the sufficiency and superiority of the former. And the Jewish legend of the presence and intervention of angels at Sinai, to which Stephen appeals in Ac 7^{53} in order to enhance the dignity of the Law, is applied by Paul to illustrate its inferiority. The promise came direct; the Law only mediately, and that by a double mediation, passing first through the hands of the angels, and then through those of Moses. The mediation of angels therefore tended rather to depreciate the Law in comparison with the promise, just as in He 2^{2} it is suggested as depreciating the Law in comparison with the gospel.

2. This is consistent with the fact specially emphasized in the Epistles of the Captivity, that the angels themselves were created beings. Paul here only goes beyond the current belief of Judaism in assigning their creation to Christ.[2]

3. The knowledge of the angels is limited. This again is common to Jewish and to New Testament thought. In the *Slavonic Enoch* (24^{3}) we read: 'Not even to my angels have I told my secrets, nor have I informed them of their origin, nor have they understood my infinite creation which I tell thee of this day.' And so, according to St. Paul, it is actually one of the privileges of the Church to make known the manifold wisdom of God unto the principalities and the powers in heavenly places (Eph 3^{10}).[3]

4. The angels require redemption, or at least reconciliation to God, and it was part of the work of Christ to effect this reconciliation. The idea that angels, unless specified as 'evil' or 'fallen,' are sinless is not supported by the Old Testament. There are not wanting passages which indicate the opposite, as, for example, Job 4^{18}, 'He putteth no trust in his servants, and his angels he chargeth with folly.'[4] And so the Apostle includes them in the sweep of the Atonement.

[1] *E.g.*, *Slavonic Secrets of Enoch*, xx. 20: 'And these men took me thence and brought me to the seventh heaven, and I saw there a very great light and all the fiery hosts of great archangels and incorporeal powers and lordships and principalities and powers; cherubim and seraphim, thrones.'

[2] Col 1^{16}; on the Jewish view, see St. John Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemp. Jewish Thought*, p. 150.

[3] Cf. 1 P 1^{12}, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακυψαι.

[4] Cf. also 21^{22}, Ps 82^{1}, Is 24^{21}; and see Thackeray, *ut sup.* p. 155.

(*To be concluded.*)

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF CHRONICLES.

He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart.—2 CHRON. XXV. 2.

He did it with all his heart, and prospered.—2 CHRON. XXXI. 21.

1. THE first of these passages refers to Amaziah, the second to Hezekiah. Both were kings of Judah, and both were good men. Of Amaziah it is said, 'he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord'; and of Hezekiah it is said, 'He wrought that which was good and right and faithful before the Lord his God.' Yet the one failed, and the other succeeded. What was the cause of Amaziah's failure? It was half-heartedness. 'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord,

but not with a perfect heart.' The secret of Hezekiah's success, on the other hand, was his whole-heartedness. 'In every work that he began in the service of the house of God, and in the law, and in the commandments, to seek his God, he did it with all his heart, and prospered.'

2. Let us look at the life and character of these two kings.

(1) *Amaziah.*—Amaziah was twenty-five years of age when he succeeded to the throne. As a boy he had been conscientious and well-behaved. Josephus says, He was exceeding careful of doing what was right, and this when he was very young.

The first thing that he did when he was settled on the throne was to avenge the murder of his father, Joash. A cruel conspiracy had been framed by the servants of the palace, and they had slain the king upon his bed. His son could not rest until these miscreants had been brought to justice. If he had carried out the vindictive practices of his own time, he would have destroyed their families too; but he called to mind an enactment in the law of Moses, to the effect that children should not be made to suffer for the sins of their fathers, and he spared them alive.

The great exploit of his reign was a military campaign against the Edomites. The country of Edom bordered on Palestine, and in the days of king Jehoshaphat it was subject to Judah; but for some time the people had successfully revolted, and Amaziah was seized with the ambition to reduce them to obedience again, and so to extend the glory of his kingdom. Amaziah led forth his army against the Edomites, gaining a signal victory over them in the valley of Salt, where ten thousand were left dead upon the field. Other ten thousand he took as prisoners, and, bringing them to the top of the steep cliffs of that rocky region, threw them over headlong, so that they were dashed in pieces.

His very success, however, proved in the long run to be his ruin. Elated with the splendid victory he had achieved, he forsook the God of his fathers. He was foolish enough to take back into his own country some of the idol gods of Edom, and wicked enough to set them up as objects of worship. Yielding himself to degrading superstition, he actually bowed himself down before these heathen deities, and burned incense to them. On this, a prophet came to him, and rebuked him for his gross idolatry; but this only provoked the king to rage, and he bade the prophet hold his peace, and threatened to smite him if he interfered. The man of God replied that he would indeed hold his peace, but warned the king that he had incurred the wrath of the Most High, and that his destruction was not far off.

The prediction was fulfilled, and that in a remarkable and tragic manner. Amaziah, puffed up with pride, seems to have fairly lost his head. His great victory over the Edomites gave him a thirst for further conquest. So, in a vein of insolence, he sent a challenge to the king of Israel to come and try their strength in battle.

Amaziah hastened to bring his army to the field; but as soon as his men were drawn up in battle array, a strange, unaccountable panic seized them, so that they fled in every direction, and left their king alone, who was immediately taken prisoner by the enemy. Moreover, to add to his humiliation, Joash threatened to kill him, unless he would persuade the people of Jerusalem, his own capital, to open their gates to the conqueror. This Amaziah did; but, not content therewith, Joash broke down a part of the ancient wall, and drove his chariot through the breach, leading his royal prisoner captive behind him; and not till he had rifled the king's palace, and taken away all the costly treasures of the temple, did he set him at liberty and return to Samaria. The end of Amaziah was a sad one. Betrayed by his own friends, who made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem, he fled to the city of Lachish, but they sent after him, and slew him there.

(2) *Hezekiah.*—There is reason to believe that Amaziah had a pious upbringing, whereas Hezekiah, as the son of Ahaz, is more likely to have been brought up in familiarity with apostasy and evil.

Yet, as soon as he came to the throne, Hezekiah set about reforming the national religion. He abolished idolatry, and restored the worship of Jehovah; he reopened the temple, reinstated the priests and Levites, recommenced the daily service, restored the Passover, and raised so high the religious tone of his country that it was said of him 'there was none like him among all the kings of Judah.'

That he was not deficient in military qualities is shown by his successes against the Philistines, seemingly in the latter part of his reign after the overthrow of Sennacherib (2 K 18^8), and by the

efficient measures taken by him for the defence of Jerusalem against the Assyrians. But he assiduously cultivated the arts of peace, and by wise management of finance, and the attention which, after the example of David and Uzziah, he paid to agriculture and the increase of flocks and herds, he became possessed, even in troubled times, of an ample exchequer and treasures of wealth (2 Ch 32^{27-29}, 2 K 20^{13}, Is 39^{2}). Himself a sacred poet, and probably the author of other psalms besides that in Is 38, he seems to have collected the psalms of David and Asaph for the temple-worship, and certainly employed competent scribes to complete the collection of Proverbs.

The great event of his reign was the campaign of Sennacherib against Judah, which ended with the complete discomfiture of the Assyrian king and his mysterious but ignominious return to his own land. This event is celebrated in Byron's famous hymn:

> The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold.

Then we have an account of his sickness and miraculous recovery, upon which he received congratulations from Merodach-Baladan, king of Babylon. After this embassy we have only a general account of the peace and prosperity in which Hezekiah closed his days. In later times, he was held in honour as the king who had 'after him none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him' (2 K 18^{5}); in Jer $26^{17ff.}$ the elders of the land cite him as an example of pious submission to the word of the Lord spoken by Micah; and the son of Sirach closes his recital of the kings with this judgment—that of all the kings of Judah, 'David, Hezekiah, and Josiah alone transgressed not, nor forsook the law of the Most High.'

It is a striking fact that in his early youth Amaziah was in all probability carefully instructed in the knowledge and worship of the Lord. From the express mention of his mother's name, both here and in the Book of Kings, I fancy she was a good and pious woman; and that her faithful training had much to do with the early promise he gave of a useful and honourable career. Many a time, I dare say, Jehoaddan (for such was her name) would take her son aside, and in fervent prayer commend him to the God of his fathers, and tell him of the heroic deeds of some of his saintly ancestors, and point out to him the responsibilities which, in future years, would devolve upon him.[1]

[1] J. Thain Davidson, *Forewarned—Forearmed*, 220.

Hezekiah, on the other hand, spent his youth in an atmosphere of irreligion and loose living. He was the son of one of the most impious monarchs that ever sat on the throne of Israel. Bad blood was in his veins. His youth was cursed by a most polluted parental example. The abominations of Oriental idolatry were the atmosphere of his childhood. Not in the retirement of a private home, surrounded by better homes, did he live, but among the splendid corruptions of a court which set the current of popular opinion, and defiled the whole kingdom.[2]

3. Now, when we compare the histories of these two kings, we notice that—

(1) Hezekiah did work that he was called to do, while Amaziah entered upon undertakings solely out of personal ambition.

(2) Amaziah trusted in God for the success of his undertakings, but not whole-heartedly, as Hezekiah did. He gave some of his interest and affections to the gods of Edom. And in those days a divided heart in religion was sure to be followed by failure in life. Is it not so still? Hezekiah made a covenant with Jehovah and stood loyally by it. 'It is in mine heart,' he says, 'to make a covenant with the Lord.' And, strengthened thus, he was able to initiate and carry out a great reform in Israel. Nobody seems to have suggested it to him. No prophet came to warn or to stimulate him. The movement grew up silently in his own heart. God and he planned it alone. Probably he had been brooding over it and praying over it for years. Men do not spring into such honour at a bound. At last he was the soul of the reform. The idea was his; the measures were his; the execution was his. So it often is in other great works of God. Some one man heads it; puts his soul into it; gives his life to it; rouses other men, and energizes them in it. There is almost no limit to the power of a live man called of God to a great life's work. Other men fall back to the right and to the left, and let such a man go up the highway of the King, while they fall in at the rear, and acknowledge his lead.

4. Whole-heartedness is necessary to success in every kind of enterprise or work.

(1) Look around you in business. Who are the young men that rise in the establishment? Not the men who sleep behind the counter, who are glad to avoid a customer. Employers soon discover those who throw energy into their work, and they like a young man who has 'push' in him;

[2] Austin Phelps, *The Old Testament*, 111.

he is sure to be promoted, and in time will become a trader on his own account. Who are the merchants that succeed in this busy time of competition? The lazy sluggards? No; the men who are diligent in business, who do what they do with both their hands, who breast the current with all their strength, scorning to be carried down the stream to the cataract of bankruptcy. Who are the men that rise to eminence? Men do not go to bed and wake up in the morning to find themselves famous, at least not until they have encountered many stern labours; for God does not at this day give harvests to idle men except harvests of thistles; nor is He pleased to send wealth to the man who will not dig in the field to find its treasure. It is universally confessed that if a man would prosper, he must be diligent in business; for at this day, beyond every preceding age, is it true, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.'

'Whatever I have tried to do in my life,' said Charles Dickens, 'I have tried with all my heart to do well. What I have devoted myself to, I have devoted myself to completely. Never to put one hand to anything on which I could throw my whole self, and never to affect depreciation of my work, whatever it was, I find now to have been golden rules.'[1]

O to be up and doing, O
Unfearing and unshamed to go
In all the uproar and the press
About my human business!
My undissuaded heart I hear
Whisper courage in my ear.
With voiceless calls, the ancient earth
Summons me to a daily birth.[2]

(2) The same thing is true if we leave mercantile pursuits, and survey any other of the walks of life. If a man would make discoveries in science, he does not hit upon them by accident; but, he being in the way, science meets him. If a man would become eminent as a physician, he must walk the hospitals. If he would attain position at the bar, he must give days and nights to the folios of law. There is no hope for a man in anything in these times unless he proceeds to it with all his heart.

When *ten* men are so earnest on one side that they will sooner be killed than give way, and *twenty* are earnest enough on the other to cast their votes for it, but will not risk their skins, *the ten will give the law to the twenty*, in virtue of the robuster faith, and of the strength which goes along with it.[3]

One of the most disappointing and dangerous people in society is the man or woman who is agreeable, and plausible, and sparkling, and amusing, but insincere, changeable, and unprincipled and facile. There is no disloyalty, no baseness, such a person may not be capable of, not so much because he is immoral, but because he is slack. You must not count him a friend, since he may cast you off to-morrow; you must not assume he will stand temptation, since his character is weak at the foundation.[4]

(3) It is the same in religion as it is in other things. Do not treat religion as though it were a business; but put as much force, and power, and energy, and heartiness, and earnestness into religion as ever you do into business. Under God the Holy Spirit our only hope lies in the development of energy within us, in the bringing out of earnestness in Christian souls.

Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, had the portrait of Henry Martyn, the tireless missionary, hung on the wall of his study. Whenever he entered his room, the eyes looked upon him, and the lips seemed to say, 'Be earnest; don't trifle.' Simeon was in the habit of bowing to the portrait and saying, 'I will be in earnest; I will not trifle; for souls are perishing, and Jesus is to be glorified.'[5]

5. If we are whole-hearted for Christ, there are three ways in which we will show it:

(1) Our thoughts will be constantly turned to Him and the progress of His kingdom.

The hidden source of the beauty and power of John Wesley's life is to be found in an incident in his College life. He read Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living and Holy Dying*, and it worked on him like a revelation. 'Instantly,' he says, 'I resolved to devote all my life to God, being thoroughly convinced that every part of my life must either be a sacrifice to God or myself—that is, in effect, to the devil.' The life that followed (1735–1791) is the greatest life of the eighteenth century. The measure of his worth was the worth of his aim. He aimed at God.[6]

In the diary of Jonathan Edwards, we find the following account of his feelings towards the Lord's work: 'I had great longing for the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the world; my secret prayer used to be in great part taken up in praying for it. If I heard the least hint of anything that had happened in any part of the world, which appeared to me in some respect or other to have favourable aspect on the interest of Christ's kingdom, my soul eagerly caught at it, and it would much animate and refresh me. I used to be earnest to read public news letters, mainly to that end, to see if I

[1] S. L. Wilson, *Helpful Words for Daily Life*, 175.
[2] R. L. Stevenson, *Songs of Travel*.
[3] J. A. Froude.
[4] J. Watson, *The Homely Virtues*, 59.
[5] J. A. Clapperton.
[6] *Ibid.*

could not find some news favourable to the interest of religion in the world.'

(2) When we resolve to do something for Him and His kingdom we will carry our resolutions into action,

> For still the Lord is Lord of might;
> In deeds, in deeds, he takes delight;
> The plough, the spear, the laden barks,
> The field, the founded city, marks;
> He marks the smiler of the streets,
> The singer upon garden seats;
> He sees the climber in the rocks:
> To him, the shepherd folds his flocks.
> For those he loves that underprop
> With daily virtues Heaven's top,
> And bear the falling sky with ease,
> Unfrowning caryatides.
> Those he approves that ply the trade,
> That rock the child, that wed the maid,
> That with weak virtues, weaker hands,
> Sow gladness on the peopled lands,
> And still with laughter, song and shout,
> Spin the great wheel of earth about.[1]

When a man's heart is right with God, what he has resolved to do he will do. I can speak for one, when I say I know a man who, when he feels that God has given him a work to do, and he has once resolved it shall be done, would move heaven and earth to accomplish it; and he would sooner break his heart or destroy his health than fail in it; for he feels that if it is God's work, it must be done. Man's work may stop, but God's work cannot; and when any get in his way, or seem to thwart his purpose, that man feels his zeal so boiling over that for God's sake he forgets everything else; and even dear friendships snap when it appears as if Christ's cause were imperilled. When a man becomes thoroughly alive for God, he cannot put up with those lazy sluggards who will neither work themselves nor permit others to work.[2]

(3) And our earnestness will show itself in perseverance. A man falls the first time: 'Never mind,' says he, 'it is God's work; we will try again.' He breaks down again; but he falls to rise. There he sees the mountain-summit glittering in the sunlight; and though he has a burden on his back, he vows, 'I will climb there.' He has fallen down that crag, and he lies there black with bruises, groaning and moaning. The first thing he does when he wipes his eyes of the dust, is to look up, and say, 'I will mount there yet.' He climbs anon, but an antagonist pushes him down. He has not time to stop and examine who it is and resent the insult, but he recommences the ascent. Now and then he runs; when he cannot run he walks; and when he cannot walk he creeps; and when it seems impossible to go on hands and knees, he is content to pull himself up by his hands alone, ofttimes even grasping a briar and sending a thorn into his flesh, but still saying, 'It is God's place, and He has bid me climb, and in His Divine strength I will do it. I cannot rest, I cannot be quiet till the deed be done.' Perseverance is the sure effect of whole-heartedness for God.

At a time when society was corrupt and hollow to sit heart's core, there was one—his name was Armand de Rancé—who lived in that glittering world with immense applause. Rich, noble, eloquent, handsome; he drank the cup of pleasure to the dregs, and by God's grace, while yet young, found it unutterably bitter. For a time he fell into despair; everything seemed to fall to dust in his hand, to slip into ashes at his touch. But he was not one who, as it were, longed only to purchase a cheap forgiveness, and then still to clutch at every not absolutely forbidden comfort. No; having sinned and suffered, and been forgiven, he felt that henceforth his life was consecrated, not to easy pietisms, but to heroic endeavours. He shook off everything—wealth, love, home, fame—and retired to a monastery deep among the gloomy mountain woods, where, as you approach, you pass by three pillars of Iron, on the first of which is engraved the word *Charity*, on the second *Brotherly Union*, and on the third *Silence*. To this monastery he retired, and found it in a condition truly frightful. The few monks left in it were corrupt, degraded, and ignorant to the last degree. Among these he went alone, but with the avowed hope, the avowed purpose, of reforming them; unarmed save by the force of God, and that strong-sided champion, Conscience. Many attempts were made to waylay and murder him; one monk tried to shoot him in open day. But De Rancé never flinched. He worked with his might, and, God helping him, he prospered. His most violent persecutors became his most steadfast friends. The monk who shot at him became a most humble and holy penitent. And thus, in the irresistible might of a firm purpose and a holy courage, did one man triumph over his own enemies and the enemies of God. He came to a den of robbers and left it a house of prayer.[3]

Edison, the inventor of the phonograph, is a man of genius certainly, but he is also a tremendous plodder. Witness his difficulty with the single letter S. He could not get the phonograph to reproduce it. From eighteen to twenty hours a day for seven months he worked on the single word 'specia.' He said into the phonograph 'specia, specia, specia,' but the instrument responded 'pecia, pecia, pecia.' It was enough to drive one mad, but he held firm and succeeded at last. Just think of it! From eighteen to twenty hours a day for seven months devoted to one letter.[4]

In Mackay's very last letter to me, his strong, brave heart seemed oppressed with yet another disappointment, and he wrote: 'I feel strongly inclined to throw up the

[1] R. L. Stevenson, *Underwoods*.
[2] C. H. Spurgeon.
[3] F. W. Farrar.
[4] D. Watson.

whole matter, on the present footing, and try a radically new plan.' Fourteen years of toil, and fever, and contradiction, and sorrow, and repeated disappointment! And he is strongly inclined, not to shake off the dust from his feet, not to return to England, but to try a radically new plan.[1]

What if wise men had, as far back as Ptolemy,
Judged that the earth like an orange was round,
None of them ever said, Come along, follow me,
Sail to the West, and the East will be found.
Many a day before
Ever they'd come ashore
Sadder and wiser men,
They'd have turned back again;
And that *he* did not, but did cross the sea,
Is a pure wonder, I must say, to me.[2]

[1] R. P. Ashe, in *Mackay of Uganda*, 444.

[2] Clough, *Poems*, 78.

Positive Theological Research in Germany.

By Dr. Paul Feine, Professor of Theology in the University of Halle-Wittenberg.

II.

The New Testament.

In regard to New Testament study, the greatest commentaries which appeared in the nineteenth century were those of H. A. W. Meyer and J. Chr. Hofmann, the former of moderate conservative tendencies, the latter the representative of the Erlangen Neo-Lutheran theology. Meyer followed the glossator's method. Hofmann began from the general, utilized the particular for the benefit of the general, and always tried to reconstruct the statements of the Biblical writer in their inner form and coherence. It was not his aim to make the text comprehensible by comparing its different parts, but to understand it as an organic whole. He therefore studied carefully the progress of ideas. He did this, however, by entering into detailed discussion of exegetical views differing from his own. His commentary acquired in this way a certain heaviness and obscureness, while Meyer, who also followed out the history of exegesis, especially at important passages, was far more readable.

Nevertheless Hofmann's Commentary has had much greater influence on scientific exegesis than Meyer's. His influence is still at the present day clearly recognizable on some who have followed absolutely different lines of theological study. Even some parts of Meyer's Commentary, as the Prison Epistles, have lately been re-edited by E. Haupt in line with Hofmann's exegesis. On the whole, however, the latest issues of Meyer's Commentary are the work of the critical theologian.

The exegesis of Hofmann suffers, apart from its heaviness, from several faults which cannot be treated in detail here. Now Th. Zahn in Erlangen, who in theology is a close follower of Hofmann, has undertaken the editing of a Commentary on the New Testament which avoids, at least in great measure, these faults, and at the same time endeavours, in conformity with the resources of present-day science, to utilize the excellences of Hofmann's exegesis. For example, Zahn's commentary follows on the lines laid down by Hofmann in this respect, that it subjects to close examination the inner chain of ideas in the text and so facilitates the understanding of the Biblical writer. A continuous analysis of the ideas of others no longer has a place in the book; instead, Zahn has himself brought his immense knowledge in the sphere of patristic study to bear on the exegesis, so that the expert will find there a rich fund of information. The most important parts of this commentary are those treated by Zahn himself: Matthew, John, the Epistle to the Romans, and the Epistle to the Galatians. His commentary on Matthew, to select one example, has had a phenomenal sale. But the commentaries of his collaborators: Mark, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, the Pastoral Epistles, treated by G. Wohlenberg, Zahn's successor in the professorial chair in Erlangen; 1 and 2 Corinthians, treated by Ph. Bachmann; and the Prison Epistles by P. Ewald, are also excellent pieces of exegetical work.

By the side of this great commentary, a smaller work, destined chiefly for the use of students, is about to be undertaken, under the editorship of B. Bess, with the general title *Evangelisch-theologische Bibliothek*. Just as H. Lietzmann on the critical

side obtained the help of a number of scholars for his *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, so for this conservative work the following have placed themselves at Bess's disposal: J. Leipoldt, who will treat the Synoptics; W. Lütgert, the Gospel and Epistles of St. John; G. Hönnicke, the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse; E. Kühl, the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Galatians; A. Juncker, the Epistles to the Corinthians; and several other scholars. This commentary is to contain textual criticism, discussions of grammar and vocabulary, exegesis in the narrower sense, questions of exegetical controversy, Biblical criticism, references, parallels from religious history, and an estimate of the significance of the part under discussion for the continuity of the book, and as viewed in the light of a history of primitive Christianity.

But Bess's *Evangelisch-theologische Bibliothek* is more than a commentary. Its first part consists of a series of compendia for the separate branches of theology. The want of short comprehensive works of this kind has made itself widely felt in Germany. For students, teachers, clergymen, religious scholars, and those interested in religious matters, many of the religious text-books are too comprehensive and not always suitable for rapid reference. As a librarian, Bess has had ample opportunity for discovering this. When it came to the working out of the proposed plan, it was conservative theologians who placed themselves at his disposal. Sellin wrote the introduction to the Old Testament; the present writer undertook the introduction to the New Testament and the religion of the New Testament; F. Arnold, Church History; F. Kropatscheck, Dogmatics; P. Althaus, Ethics; J. Kunze, Symbolics; R. Seeberg, the History of the Theology of the Nineteenth Century; and so on.

Alongside of those smaller condensed works, attention has also been paid to larger handbooks. While in the critical branch of theology comprehensive works are being published by J. C. B. Mohr in Tübingen, in the *Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher*, and in the smaller volumes of the *Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften*, a *Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher* in the conservative branch of theology has been undertaken by the publishing firm of A. Deichert, late W. Scholl, in Leipzig, the same firm which is publishing the commentaries of Zahn and Sellin. The following have already appeared in this series: Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*; E. Lehmann, *Textbuch zur Religionsgeschichte*; R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*; Frank Grützmacher, *Geschichte der neueren Theologie*; L. Ihmels, *Christliche Wahrheitsgewissheit*; M. Kähler, *Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre*. Other volumes are still to follow, *e.g.* W. Lütgert, *Apostolisches Zeitalter*; P. Feine, *Leben Jesu*; A. Seeberg, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*; Church History, by G. Grützmacher and H. Böhmer; Symbolics, by W. Walther; Apologetics, by A. W. Hunzinger; Ethics, by R. H. Grützmacher.

We shall now make a more exhaustive survey of some comprehensive works of New Testament study which have appeared within the last few years. Until a few years ago, in the sphere of introduction to the New Testament, the works of H. J. Holtzmann and A. Jülicher on the side of historical criticism, and that of B. Weiss in conservative theology, were the chief. Now Th. Zahn has published his *Introduction to the New Testament*, in two volumes, 3rd edition, 1907. In this work Zahn has handled a great mass of scientific material with brilliant insight and scholarship. The uniqueness of Zahn's method lies in this, that he starts with Church tradition and, as a rule, comes to conclusions which are in harmony with it. Even those who object to this method will not be able to come away from the study of this work without taking with them a rich fund of information. Controversy with Zahn is always fruitful. A shorter introduction to the New Testament, which pays more attention to the needs of students, and so does not always explain the problems fully, is written by F. Barth, 2nd ed. 1911. The same scholar has also written a very convenient and serviceable book as a contribution to the investigation of the life of Christ, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*[4], 1911.

The text-books on Biblical theology which were chiefly used at the end of last century were those of B. Weiss and W. Beyschlag from the moderate conservative standpoint, and those of H. J. Holtzmann from the critical standpoint. In the sphere of positive theology, two new Biblical theologies have now appeared, those of A. Schlatter, 2 vols., 1909 and 1910, and of Feine, 1910, 3rd and 4th thousand, 1912, to which was added last year the critical religio-historical theology of H. Weinel. Although Schlatter and Feine have been influenced

to a great extent in their fundamental ideas by Hofmann of Erlangen, yet they proceed by very different ways and pursue different methods. Schlatter has given an exposition of the principles followed by him in a special work entitled 'Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments und die Dogmatik' in *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 1909, xiii. 2. According to this work, he regards as the first task of Biblical theology the perception of the given facts, and the observation of the processes by which the New Testament convictions have come into being. It must be clearly demonstrated how one tenet has been evolved out of the other, and how every single tenet is bound up with the whole consciousness and concentrated will of the person who thought it out and wrote it down. Schlatter demands that a simplified scheme of the religious process should be used as the basis of investigation, so that for those processes which are essential to every stage of piety and every particular form of faith, the New Testament data ought to be collected. He says that by extracting from the New Testament the convictions which are closely bound up in Christian experience as their causes and effects, we get New Testament theology. For the word of the New Testament does not consist of creations of the mind which have come into being quite apart from will and conduct, but of those which have grown out of the experience of life and have been created for it. As is obvious from this, Schlatter is especially concerned to give a picture of the religious and ethical life of the personalities of the New Testament. He desires to sketch the sum of facts exemplified by their lives, and to establish the inferences to be drawn from them for the Christian community. In this he consciously limits himself to the complex of tradition embodied in the New Testament.

In my theology of the New Testament I have also tried, above all, to bring to light the facts which may be gathered from the New Testament writings. Again and again in them we come upon a distinctive religious life, which in its manifestations and results is plainly visible. For the understanding of these documents, however, investigation is not limited to the sphere of the New Testament; the lines of communication leading back into the Old Testament and Jewish literature are followed out, and the whole mass of material contributed by modern research in the field of religious history is brought to bear on the subject. Thus it is made evident almost everywhere that New Testament religion is firmly grounded in Old Testament religion but goes beyond it, that the science of comparative religion contributes a not unimportant result in that it shows the forms in which primitive Christianity was able to make itself comprehensible to the people of that time, but that its true content and its religious nature can be understood only from the Divine person of Jesus and the power which flowed from Him. Further, as a result of this, it is manifest that the conception of the two great Apostles, Paul and John, held in critical work up till now, stands in need of correction. They have frequently (by Holsten, Pfleiderer, Holtzmann, and also on the conservative side by B. Weiss) been regarded predominantly in an intellectual light. Their doctrinal views were described in critical theology under the scheme of a combination of genuine Christian and Hellenistic elements, so that a glaring dualism was often apparent in them. The matter takes on another complexion, however, if we try to understand, from Christian experience and dependence on the gospel of Jesus, the intellectual world of Paul and John, in view of the stage of religious development they had reached. In this way the living and personal side of their declaration of faith is brought out much more clearly.

Of no less importance for the present theological situation is the course taken by two great New Testament discussions of late years—the question of Paul's dependence on Jesus, and the historicity of the Biblical picture of Jesus.

At the time when I was forming my own opinions upon theological matters, I discovered that one of the greatest theological problems which exist was the question, in what measure Pauline religion and theology were dependent on the historical Jesus. Accordingly, in 1899, I published *Das gesetzesfreie Evangelium des Paulus nach seinem Werdegang dargestellt*, in which, entering into discussion, more especially with C. Holsten, I followed out the lines of communication between the pre-Christian and the Christian life ideal of Paul, and proved at the same time that the reality of the occurrence at Damascus offers the key to the understanding of Paul's conversion from a Pharisee into an Apostle. In 1902 the further work *Jesus Christus und Paulus* was published, in which the question of the dependence of Paul on Jesus, treated in

various independent inquiries, was summarized and gone into more deeply. The result of my research was that Paul must have been much better acquainted and much more thoroughly conversant with the gospel of Jesus, His words, thoughts, and deeds, than would appear from a superficial examination. The proclamation and teaching of Paul on the subject of the person of Jesus, his faith in God, his doctrine of redemption and justification, his ethics, his position with regard to the law, his views on the sacraments, and his eschatology, are in my opinion only an acceptance and continuation of what was already directly present in Jesus or certainly prepared in Him. My opinions found a favourable reception in some quarters, even on the side of historical criticism (Holtzmann), but for the most part they raised dissent; in fact, an attempt was made to come to a directly opposite conclusion. W. Wrede maintained in his *Paulus*, 1905, that it was an undeniable fact that the life-work and the personality of Jesus had *not* influenced Pauline theology. The name 'Apostle of Jesus' was in no way suitable for Paul, if by that was meant his historical relationship to Jesus. In all essential points he was, in comparison with Jesus, an entirely new being; he was the second founder of Christianity, and as such he had, in comparison with the first, exercised, if not the better, at least the stronger, influence. Paul, so Wrede maintained, was much more independent of Jesus than Jesus Himself was of the noblest representatives of Jewish religion. This raised a lively discussion upon the subject of Jesus and Paul. Even the theological friends of Wrede found his judgment too extreme. Scholars even on his own side began to recognize numerous points of connexion between Jesus and Paul. By going into the religious and theological views of the primitive community, they noticed that Paul's proclamation of Christ, as well as his ethics and eschatology, agreed to a great extent with Christianity as it was before his own time. Even in those circles where stress was laid on the originality of the Pauline gospel, an active search was made for points of connexion not only between Paul and contemporary religion and mythology, but also between him and the historical Jesus.

Numerous scholars took part in this discussion, *e.g.* Goguel in France; in Germany, Kölbing, J. Kaftan, Jülicher, M. Brückner, J. Weiss, and others.[1] People were brought to reason, however, by the course taken by the discussion upon the Christ-myth. We may regard as a favourable sign the remarks which H. Weinel, though belonging to the critical branch of theology, has addressed to his theological colleagues, in a descriptive survey of this dispute. Again and again, says Weinel in his paper, *Ist das liberale Jesusbild widerlegt?* 1910, p. 16, critical theology has laid stress on how little one may learn of Jesus from Paul. He himself had formerly placed the matter in this false light. He now admits, however, not only that what Paul says about Jesus and His words is enough to prove the existence of Jesus in the Epistles of Paul, but that in all important passages the words of Jesus are heard in Paul; and that besides a whole host of details which Paul knew and wrote down, the decisive characteristics of Jesus' preaching and character have been preserved for us in the writings of this Apostle. Thus the opinion which we have long held is thoroughly justified. Let us give a warm welcome to the work of the Norwegian, P. Olaf Moe, *Paulus und die evangelische Geschichte*, Leipzig, 1912, in which the close connexion between the proclamation of Paul and the gospel of Jesus is once more demonstrated.

A unique view of the Apostle appeared last year in A. Deissmann's *Paulus*. In the same way as Renan once tried to explain the gospel of Jesus from the knowledge of the country and people of Palestine, so Deissmann now tries to explain the Apostle from the blue sky, the sultry summer heat of the East, the wearisome mountain paths over which the Apostle had to wander, and so on. What is really theological he takes away from Paul almost entirely, and sees in him the mystic, the man of moods, the meditative spirit. We fear that only a small part of this theory will prove to be tenable.

The dispute about the so-called 'Christ-myth,' which has been raging for the last three years in Germany, did not break out by chance. With Bruno Bauer, 1841; A. Kalthoff, *Das Christusproblem*, 1902, *Die Entstehung des Christentums*, 1903; W. von Schnehen, *Der moderne Jesuskultus*, 1905; W. B. Smith, *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, Giessen, 1906; P. Jensen, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*

[1] See also the article 'Jesus and Paul,' by John Gresham Machen, in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, by the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1912, pp. 547–578.

in der Weltliteratur, i. 1906, the ground had been well prepared for the attack on the historical portrait of Jesus which was made by Arthur Drews, Professor of Philosophy in the Polytechnic in Karlsruhe, in his work *Die Christusmythe*, Jena, 1909, Pt. II. 1911. Drews maintained that the gospel writings did not contain the history of a real man, but only the myth of the 'God-man,' Jesus, clothed in the form of history. Old Testament prototypes of the Messiah (Moses, Elias, Elisha, etc.), as well as certain mythical conceptions of the neighbouring heathen tribes—conceptions which were closely connected with the belief in a Divine Redeemer—had contributed to the 'history' of that Jesus. Everything of consequence and of decisive religious importance in the Christian faith, as, for example, the baptism, the last supper, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, was borrowed from the cult symbolism of the mythical Jesus, and owed its rise not to an historical fact, but to the pre-Christian faith in the half-Jewish, half-heathen redeeming Deity.

The theological deductions of Drews are dilettante, through and through. He has made the most glaring mistakes and omissions; he has taken very little trouble, before publishing his opinions on these matters, to investigate them thoroughly in a scientific way. The mainspring of his argument, however, is, as is clearly seen in his work, his monistic view of things. That this has led him to take up a position of antagonism to historical Christianity is only natural. But our opponents have, as is well known, the sharpest eye for our weaknesses, and so Drews has undoubtedly discovered a vulnerable point in the armour of theological research. This is the argument of liberal theology that an historical portrait of Jesus which does not overstep the limits of the human may be obtained from the Gospels by means of historical criticism. The bitter arguments of Drews and his colleagues are directed against the religious worship of the ideal man, Jesus. It has time and again been pointed out by the representatives of the theory of the Christ-myth that 'the *Jesuanism* of liberal theology,' *i.e.* the claim to be able to draw a true portrait of Christ on the foundation of historical criticism, is a Utopia; what really appears in the Gospels is the portrait of the Son of God who appeared on earth as Redeemer.

It is not without a certain amount of justification that Drews and his colleagues claim that the logical result of liberal-theological research is the complete denial of the historical existence of Jesus. Bousset—who has since, it must be admitted, taken up the symbolical view of the person of Jesus—in his controversy with Kalthoff in the first decade of this century, would allow only a few of Jesus' words to stand as historically trustworthy—such as the Parable of the Prodigal Son, the declaration of the Fatherly love of God, or Jesus in dispute with the Pharisees. In his *Messiasgeheimnis*, 1901, Wrede tried to prove that the contents of Mark's Gospel along with Christ's proclamation of Himself as the Messiah before Cesarea Philippi are in their essential points nothing but a new form of the primitive Christian communal tradition, so that Jesus probably never did designate Himself the Messiah. In the same direction, Wellhausen, in his works upon the Synoptic Gospels advances a very far-reaching criticism.

Thus the impression was naturally made upon outsiders that everything was still rather obscure in the field of critical research into the Gospels, and that an entirely new construction was necessary. Was an impetus in that direction not given when the whole portrait of Christ in the Gospels was declared unhistorical and the rise of the gospel tradition explained otherwise?

The objections of the representatives of the Christ-myth to the liberal portrait of Jesus correspond to a great extent, so far as contents are concerned, to what we on the modern positive side have always brought against the liberal portrait of Jesus, and always will bring against it. The only difference is that we as colleagues aim at a more friendly style of polemic, while they set to work in much more drastic fashion. In particular, we have always shown that the transmission of the Gospels offered no excuse for suppressing some of the features of the portrait of Jesus while setting up the rest as historically certain. We also recognized that the real reason for such a differentiation did not lie in the sources, but in the mind of the critic.

Those representing the theory of the Christ-myth have no intention of pursuing a course of apologetics. The Christian belief in a divinely human Redeemer is nothing more to them than a myth. But the real reason of this judgment is not historical but religio-philosophical; or, to express it differently, it is a judgment of the volition. Here we find ourselves, however, outside the sphere of

what may be scientifically proved. At the same time those holding this view have formed correct opinions on many points. Historical tradition in itself does not offer the security which faith needs. A simple historical personage cannot be the foundation of religious faith. A man, though he be an ideal man, cannot redeem us. The gospel has from the very beginning, however, always been the proclamation of the Divine Jesus sent by God into the world for our redemption. This mission may be accepted or rejected; it cannot be changed. So we conservative theologians held ourselves in reserve at first in this dispute. We have followed with great pleasure the many tendencies on the part of the critical school towards a deeper view of the Person of Jesus; but we think that our particular task lies in penetrating with the means and methods of present-day scientific research into the fulness, the wealth and the super-historicity of the Biblical evidence of Christ, and in so working at our part that our knowledge also may help to bear witness to the majesty of Christ as our Divine Saviour.

In conclusion, we may call attention to the unique attempt of a conservative theologian to find the beginnings of ecclesiastical dogma in the Apostolic period. A. Seeberg has in a number of works, of which the most important are *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*, 1903; *Das Evangelium Christi*, 1904; *Christi Person und Werk nach der Lehre seiner Jünger*, 1910, tried to prove the existence in the Apostolic period of a christological dogma, which forms the foundation of the second article of the Apostolic Confession of Faith. This dogma Seeberg considers as 'the gospel' which was preached from the beginning by Jesus' disciples, and he traces the origin of this gospel back to Jesus Himself. Even though these contentions will not easily be justified, yet Seeberg is at any rate right in this, that the beginnings of creed-making reach back to New Testament times.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Feine's 'New Testament Theology.'[1]

The first edition of this excellent work was noticed in The Expository Times, July 1910, pp. 454–456. Its comprehensiveness of treatment, sanity of judgment, and religious insight have carried it already into the honour of a second edition; and, as the author has diligently worked over many sections, it deserves more than a mere chronicle of its appearance in this form. Numerically, there are only ten more pages. But Dr. Feine has introduced a much larger amount of material than this addition would suggest; a number of paragraphs have been abbreviated; small print has been used pretty freely; and in this way space has been secured for fresh matter[2] which often clears up the processes of argument. These changes make it practically a new book, although there is no retreat from the conclusions of the original edition.

The chapters on the Synoptic Gospels have been radically re-cast. Instead of starting with the Messianic consciousness of Jesus, Dr. Feine, in deference to his critics, now begins with the attitude of Jesus towards Judaism; this is followed by Jesus' call to repentance, and by a chapter on the kingdom of God,[3] which leads up to the moral demands of Jesus (replacing a chapter on his ethics, which formerly stood between chapters 8 and 9). The seventh, eighth, and ninth chapters on 'Die Versöhnung,' 'The resurrection, return, and judgment,' and 'the permanent significance of the person of Jesus,' remain on the whole much as they were, with the exception of the first, in which the author has stated with greater precision his view that the redemptive element is organic to the teaching of our Lord (p. 167 f.). There is a detailed defence (p. 152 f.) of the authenticity of the ransom-saying (Mt 20^{28} = Mk 10^{45}); it goes back, Feine thinks, to a combination, in the

[1] *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Von D. Dr. Paul Feine. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911. Zweite, stark umgearbeitete Auflage. M.12.50: geb.14.50.

[2] Particularly in connexion with the *religionsgeschichtliche* movement, which is criticized not only in the introductory chapters, but throughout the course of the whole book.

[3] In this chapter (p. 68) Dr. Feine frankly admits that neither Mt $16^{18f.}$ nor Mt $18^{18f.}$ are authentic sayings of Jesus, as they stand. Both represent the standpoint of the Jewish Christian Church, though some genuine word of Jesus may be at the root of the former passage.

consciousness of Jesus, of the 'Son of Man' idea and 'the Suffering Servant' idea, and it tallies not only with the meaning of the Lord's Supper, but with Christ's whole conception of His death as an atoning sacrifice. One of the outstanding features of the whole book (*e.g.* pp. 103 f., 146 f. 187 f., etc.) is the opposition to anything like a distinction between a Jesus-religion and a Christian-religion in the N.T. It will be obvious, therefore, that Dr. Feine cannot sympathize with any recent claims for Paul as the founder of Christian theology. He finds the religious presuppositions of Paul's doctrine already present in the consciousness and teaching of Jesus.

In the introductory chapter upon Paulinism a new section on the principles of Pauline criticism (pp. 220–223) is introduced.[1] But more significant is the fact that chapters 6 and 7 of the first edition, on 'Paul's conception of Christ' and 'The significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus, have been not only re-cast but put forward to the front of the discussion on Paul's theology, replacing the chapters on 'Sin,' 'Paul's relation to the Law and Judaism,' 'das Schriftprinzip,' and 'God.' A new chapter on the Pauline Gnosis is also inserted after the chapter on the Spirit. The whole section is a masterpiece of condensed statement, whatever may be thought of some of its particular conclusions.

The indebtedness of the Fourth Gospel's Theology to Paulinism (p. 539 f.) is discussed under four headings: (i.) It is to Paul that we ultimately owe the sense of Christ's universal significance and of Christianity as a religion for the world. (ii.) The supersession of Judaism, which is presupposed in the Fourth Gospel, follows from this achievement of Paul. (iii.) Even the Pauline Christology, in spite of its peculiar features, has paved the way for the Johannine idea of Christ as the likeness and firstborn and fullness of God. (iv.) Finally, the conception of Christ as God's supreme revelation of love, is carried on from Paul into the special interests of the Johannine theology. To the latter problem Dr. Feine has devoted great pains, in both editions. In the second it is noticeable that the Johannine theology precedes, instead of following, the section upon the other post-Pauline writings of the N.T., while the Apocalypse has been shifted from the former to the latter (a step in advance, although Dr. Feine thinks we cannot describe as 'impossible' the Church-tradition which ascribes both the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John). A new chapter on the relation of John to Judaism has been added, which includes some paragraphs on the odes of Solomon (pp. 549–550). He rightly regards the odes as steeped not in Jewish, but in Oriental, gnostic mysticism, and as influenced by the N.T., instead of throwing light on any incipient 'Johannine' conceptions within the Christianity of the first century, much less within Judaism. The chapter on the relation between John and Hellenism has been re-named and re-cast, and the concluding chapter on the details of the Johannine doctrine of salvation has been much enlarged. In noticing Reitzenstein's argument from the Hermetic literature, Dr. Feine arrives at a negative conclusion which is not altogether unjustified. 'R.'s investigations throw fresh light on the religious idea of the Logos outside the Christianity of the church, on the significance of Egyptian theologumena for the later syncretism of paganism and gnosticism, and on the history of the Hermetic and Egyptian literature of revelation; but none of the extant Hermetic writings goes back earlier than the third century A.D., and therefore they contribute nothing of direct importance for an inquiry into the contemporary ideas with which John came into conflict' (p. 558). Neither here nor elsewhere will the reader of this handbook encounter what Dr. Johnson called 'learning confused by the multiplicity of its own views.' Dr. Feine deals conscientiously with all sorts of opinions, but he has a mind of his own, and the knack of expressing it crisply.

The concluding section upon 'Die theologischen Anschauungen der gemeinchristlichen Schriften' starts with the Apocalypse, and then discusses, as before, Hebrews, James, First Peter, Jude, Second Peter, Mark, Matthew, and the Lucan writings. The character of the materials makes this part of Dr. Feine's work rather discursive. It is the least suggestive section of his book. In discussing the Virgin-Birth (p. 679 f.) he rejects, of course, the ὃς . . . ἐγεννήθη reading of John 1[18] as irrelevant to the context, and admits that the stories in Mt 1 and Lk 1 are neither strong nor homogeneous evidence; still, it is argued, this dogma or tradition expresses a truth which is directly related to the valuation of Christ's person

[1] The theology of the Pastoral Epistles is, of course, treated separately (p. 503 f.); they are evidence for the later interests of the Church.

by Christian faith. Incidentally (p. 688 f.) he considers, against Harnack, that the hymns in Lk 1–2 belong to a special Jewish-Christian tradition. In the synoptic Gospels he refuses to see Pauline or anti-Pauline tendencies; but the growing 'Catholicism' of the Church, behind Matthew and Luke, is candidly recognized. Second Peter is pseudonymous (pp. 670–672), and the Alexandrian element in Hebrews (p. 644 f.) is estimated,[1] though not with an adequate appreciation of its full influence upon the theology of the Epistle.

This section, indeed, is a sort of anti-climax, after the cardinal topics of Jesus, Paul, and John; it would have been still more so, had not Dr. Feine added seventeen pages, by way of a special summary, upon the main ideas of N.T. Theology (pp. 689–706). This recapitulates the conclusions of the earlier sections. In speaking of the Gospel, he refuses to take the genitive in τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ as genitivus subjecti (p. 690). Paul's idea of Christ as the object and content of the Gospel tallies with Christ's own view of His person as central to the cause of the kingdom. 'The chief and all-embracing truth for Paul is not the idea of the founding and realization of the kingdom through the Son, but the reality of God's saving will and power bound up in Christ; and this was already the kernel of the preaching of Jesus upon earth' (p. 692).

The volume is capitally indexed. The literature cited is nearly all German; hardly any English works on N.T. theology seem to be known to the writer, and very few French. This is a provincialism, however, in which Dr. Feine is not singular. Fortunately, the defect is less serious than it would have been if his work had been shaped on the scale and method of Holtzmann's.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Oxford.

[1] Similarly, the Philonic and Hellenistic hinterland of the Fourth Gospel (p. 551 f.) is recognized much more frankly by Feine than, *e.g.*, by Beyschlag or B. Weiss

A Survey.

The Bible.

PROFESSOR KARL MARTI of Berne has revised his *Kurzgefasste Grammatik der Biblisch-Aramäischen Sprache* for a second edition. It belongs to the series entitled 'Porta Linguarum Orientalium.' The publishers are Messrs. Reuther & Reichard of Berlin (M.4.50).

A series of volumes under the general title of 'Handböcker i Teologi' has been projected by some of the most learned theologians of Sweden. The series is to be published in Stockholm by Messrs. P. A. Norstedt & Sons. Those who are responsible for the series have done wisely in persuading Professor Erik Stave to open it with a volume entitled *Inledning till Gamla Testamentets Kanoniska Skrifter* (7 kr. 50 öre). Professor Stave is a most accomplished theologian. He has made himself master of the history of religion, having discovered that the comparative study of religion is essential to the understanding of the Old Testament, or, indeed, to any fruitful work in theology; and he is well acquainted with English as well as with German literature. This is a handsome volume, original and up to date.

Lic. theol. Wilhelm Möller has written an account of a new conception of the problem of the Pentateuch under the title of *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung* (Bertelsmann; M.3).

Once more an investigation, thorough and independent, has been made into the Chronology of the Old Testament. The author is Professor Antonio Deimel of Rome. The whole of the Babylonian literature has been taken account of, and the results have been set forth in a magnificent set of tables and charts. These charts contain a complete list of the kings of Babylonia and Assyria. The lists are given in cuneiform, with translation, and the approximate dates are inserted. This valuable work has been published by Max Bretschneider in Rome, under the title of *Veteris Testamenti Chronologia Monumentis Babylonico-Assyriis Illustrata* (4s. 6d.).

Professor Karl Marti has published his Rectorial Address at Berne, under the title of *Stand und Aufgabe der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart* (Max Drechsel; 80 pf.).

The Psalms in Hebrew, with an English translation and brief textual notes, in a fine large volume and beautifully printed (*Die Psalmen, hebräisch und deutsch mit einem kurzen wissenschaftlichen Kommentar*), has been published in Graz and Vienna by Dr. Rivard Schlögl, Professor in the University of Vienna. The publishing house is the Verlagsbuchhandlung 'Styria' (M.10).

The second volume of Lietzmann's 'Catenenstudien' is entitled *Die Catene des Vaticanus Gr.*

1802 zu den Proverbien. The transcription is due to Dr. Otto Hoppmann (Hinrichs; M.10).

Messrs. Hinrichs are also the publishers of a brochure by Professor Strack, entitled *P'saḥim der Mišnatraktat Passafest* (M.1.80).

Under the title of *Die Selbstoffenbarung Jesu*, Dr. Heinrich Schumacher has published a critical and exegetical study of Mt 11^{27}, 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' It is one of the most elaborate and exhaustive studies of a Scripture text that we have had for a long time.

An essay by Bertram, Bishop of Norwich, on the origin and meaning of the title 'Son of Man,' has been published by Mr. Murray both in Latin and in English. The title is *De Verbis Filius Hominis* (1s. 6d. net).

To the literature on the historicity of Jesus add *Wissen wir etwas Sicheres über Jesus?* by Johannes Jeremias (Deichert; M.0.80).

The same publishers issue what is called a 'religio-psychological' study by Lic. Dr. Werner Elert, under the title of *Die Religiosität des Petrus*, (M.1.50).

They also publish a volume of talks to young theologians on the parables in Mt 13, with the title *Altes und Neues aus dem Schatz eines Hausvaters* (M.2.40).

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have issued the last portion of the new edition of H. J. Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*, as edited by Jülicher & W. Bauer (1s. 6d.).

The latest issue of Harnack's 'Beiträge' is entitled *Über den privaten Gebrauch der Heiligen Schriften in der Alten Kirche* (Hinrichs; M.3).

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London.

IV.

(1) The adequacy of the metaphysical formulæ used in regard to the Person of Christ can only be tested by a minute examination of the terms employed. The most famous term is ὁμοούσιον, consubstantial, which is expanded in the phrase ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς. (i.) It is well known that the term gave great offence to many conservative theologians, for it was suspected as having been used by Sabellianism, in which the three persons (πρόσωπα, not ὑποστάσεις) are only modes, successive in time, of the οὐσία (substantia) of God, who is unity (μονάς). These modes are consubstantial, and so ὁμοούσιον appeared to threaten a return to this modal monarchianism. (ii.) We must trace the use of the term οὐσία further back in order to fix the meaning of Athanasius, and thus to show whether this reproach was justified or not. 'The term οὐσία (essence) in Aristotle, signified first a thing in the concrete, which is a subject and cannot be a predicate, an individual object, the supporter of attributes; and secondly, a class, be it a species or a larger class, a genus' (Fisher's *History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 137). This ambiguity of the term is a serious defect when it is used in precise definition to mark off orthodoxy from heresy. It is certain that Athanasius did not mean that Christ was an individual of a divine species or genus, and the Father another; for that would have have been a return to polytheism, and would have made the trinity not a unity, but a society. Popular Christian language, it must be observed, often comes perilously near such tritheism. But, on the other hand, if Athanasius had meant that Father and Son are an individual subject, the supporter of attributes, he would have fallen back into modalism, a denial of the eternal distinction of Father and Son in the unity of the Godhead. His meaning lies between regarding Christ and God as one individual, and as two individuals of one species or genus. While more is meant than a qualitative similarity, not quite as much as a quantitative identity is intended. Neither of the two original senses of the term οὐσία can be carried over into

the meaning he assigned to ὁμοούσιον. Certainly the rival term ὁμοιούσιον was not preferable, for it denies both the unity of substance and even the sameness of the class to which Christ and God belong. (iii.) The Creed of Chalcedon, probably unintentionally, takes advantage of the ambiguity of the term to describe Christ as also ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. This must mean that Christ and we belong to the same species—man, for it is not likely that the fathers assumed an individual entity—mankind, to which individual men hold similar relation as the Father and the Son to the unity of the Godhead. The following clause seems to indicate this κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας; Christ is not one with us, but like to us as belonging to the same species. This difference in the meaning of the term οὐσία may perhaps be made plainer by an illustration in our English speech. It means both the abstract general as mankind, and the concrete general as *the man*. To speak of Christ's divinity or Godhead is not to affirm what Athanasius meant by ὁμοούσιον. He intended to assert that the Son no less and no otherwise than the Father belongs to the one God.

(2) Again, how far does the phrase ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πατρὸς carry us? This is the Nicene formula; the Chalcedon Creed reads: πρὸ αἰώνων ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, and ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς Παρθένου τῆς Θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. The Athanasian statement runs: 'Deus est ex substantia Patris ante saecula genitus: Home ex substantia Matris in saeculo natus.' Here, again, words are used ambiguously: (i.) The generation out of the substance of the Father expresses in the intention of the Creed distinction but not separation; the generation out of the substance of the mother surely expresses separation. Thus the Nicene formula, if we were to interpret it by the parallelism in the Athanasian, would not necessarily guard the unity of Father and Son in the Godhead, but might mean separation as well as distinction. Two further questions about this language may be asked. (ii.) Does not the term *generation*, even when qualified by the epithet *eternal*, suggest not only the origin of one individual in another, but even the subsequent separation of the one from the other? Again, in the phrase in the Athanasian symbol *ex substantia Matris*, is not the term *substantia* used in a more narrowly physical reference than its proper meaning allows? A physical analogy may illustrate the different senses of the parallel phrases. As the branch may be said to be of the substance of the tree, so is the Son of the Father; as the offspring is of the substance of the parent, so is Christ of Mary. One other consideration must at this point be advanced. It will be observed how carefully the derivation from Mary is guarded by the qualifying phrase κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα. Is the description of Mary as τῆς Θεοτόκου not illogical, inconsistent? If the being generated from Mary was confined to the manhood, how can the generating be extended to the Godhead? One feels that the title is inserted not because it was necessary, but because the phrase had been accepted as orthodox.

(3) Another term employed, the meaning of which is ambiguous, is φύσις. In the phrase ἐν δύο φύσεσιν, or ἐκ δύο φύσεων, the term seems to be nearly, if not quite, equivalent to οὐσία. Popularly nature and substance are used interchangeably; but, strictly defined, the difference is that between manhood and mankind or the man. The substance is the existent entity; the nature is the totality of its attributes or characteristics. 'Different substances might have attributes in common, and so their natures might be similar; but they themselves remained distinct, and in thought at least could be distinguished from their natures; while the natures, too, of different things might have much in common with one another, but yet remained distinct, and could be spoken of almost as if they were real existences in themselves. This, however, was only a loose mode of speech—the reality was always the "substance" to which the nature belonged. The "nature" was not conceived of as being the "substance," nor the "substance" as being the "nature." "It" was not "its nature," nor was "its nature" "it"' (Bethune-Baker, p. 48). (i.) Recognizing this distinction, we may urge that what the Creed of Chalcedon did by changing from the term οὐσία to the term φύσις was to introduce ambiguity in the statement. Whenever we sum up the orthodox Christology in the phrase 'two natures in one person,' we do not mean exactly what the fathers intended. They meant to affirm two substances in the one person, unconfused and unchanged, although they used at this point 'nature' for 'substance.' They meant a divine subject and a human subject distinct the one from the other, in one person (πρόσωπον, ὑπόστασις),

as the subsequent disputes about one will or two wills show. (ii.) What most persons using the formula to-day would probably mean (and think themselves, under cover of the ambiguity of language, in close agreement with the creeds), is this, one subject possessing both human and divine attributes in so far as these are consistent. We identify subject and person: it is one and the same self that thinks, feels, wills; and it is difficult, if not impossible, for us to think two subjects or selves, God and man, in the unity of one person. (iii.) The Athanasian Creed confirms an interpretation of the Chalcedonian, for it runs: 'Unus domino, non confusione Substantiae, sed Unitate Personae.' It is two substances, subjects of attributes in the strict sense of the word, and not two natures in the proper use of the term, that the Creed of Chalcedon means to assert as united, unmixed, unchanged, undivided, unseparated, in one person.

(4) These four adverbs deserve closer study as they set the bounds within which the conception of the union of the natures, or more strictly the substances, must be confined. (i.) ἀσυγχύτως, 'without confusion,' forbids the thought of any blending into the unity of one subject of subjects so distinguished from, nay, even opposed to, one another as God and man; and the reason is distinctly given in the explanatory declaration of the Council 'by this confusion teaching the monstrous doctrine that the divine nature of the only-begotten is passable.' While the man in Christ suffered, it is, according to this Council, monstrous to believe that the God in Him suffered with the man. This is the pagan notion of the gods 'careless of mankind'; it is certainly not the God and Father revealed in the Son and Saviour. One subject in Christ thus suffered, and the other did not, and could not. How can we conceive any personal unity here? (ii.) ἀτρέπτως, 'without conversion,' forbids the thinking any real humiliation of God, or any real exaltation of man in the Incarnation. Paul's declaration in Ph 2^7 (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν) would be heresy to be condemned. This is the *static* view of God and man, while the Scriptural view, and the view of modern theology is *dynamic*. This too is an inheritance from Greek philosophy which exalted Being above Becoming, which conceived ultimate reality as substance, and not as spirit. And it is surely quite impossible for us with our different outlook to accept this limitation. (iii.) ἀδιαιρέτος and ἀχωρίστως, 'without division,' 'never to be separated,' may be taken together as asserting against Nestorius, or rather against what Nestorius was supposed to teach the unity of Christ's person. The doctrine of two substances (οὐσίαι), however, makes it difficult, nay, impossible, to understand how the framers of the creed would have us conceive the unity concretely. Their assertion 'the distinction of natures being in no wise done away because of the union, but rather the characteristic property of each nature being preserved, and concurring into one Person and one substance,' becomes intelligible in the measure in which we recognize the affinity of God and man, and God's communicativeness in grace, and man's receptiveness in faith, and depart from the rigid separation of God and man which is throughout the creed assumed. The first two adverbs against Eutyches and Apollinaris are inconsistent with the last two directed against Nestorius. These inconsistencies show how impossible it is by abstract metaphysical formulæ to do justice to concrete historical reality.

(5) The two words used for person, πρόσωπον and ὑπόστασις next invite our attention. (i.) It is freely admitted even by the defenders of these creeds that the Greek philosophy from which the formulæ were drawn, had no adequate conception of personality, and that it is due to the influence of Christianity in invigorating the moral conscience and vitalizing the religious consciousness that the modern conception of personality is so much clearer and fuller. Ancient Philosophy was objective, it was concerned with the idea in the thing known; modern philosophy is subjective, it inquires about the subject knowing. We must keep this distinction constantly in view, as an inadequate conception of personality alone explains how it was possible for these thinkers to conceive two substances in one person unconfused and unchanged. (ii.) The term πρόσωπον means face, countenance, or expression of the face, appearance as regards condition or circumstance. In Sabellianism the term is applied to the three modes through which the divine unity passes. Father, Son, and Spirit are *masks* or *rôles* successively assumed by the one God. Nestorius, as well as the orthodox fathers who condemned him, used the term. 'When Nestorius insisted that he believed our Lord Jesus Christ, in His Godhead and His manhood to be "one *prosopon*," it was not that they

suspected the term prosopon of any hidden heretical meaning, but that they did not believe that he really believed what he said that he believed' (Bethune-Baker, p. 52). (iii.) But, it may be asked, why was he then suspected and condemned? It was because his use of the term ὑπόστασις was different. He declined to confess our hypostasis or a hypostatic union in Christ; and in his refusal he was justified by the older usage of the term, on which a new meaning had been put.

(*a*) 'To express the conception "substance" he used either of the two Greek synonyms *ousia* and *hypostasis*, the latter more frequently than the former' (Bethune-Baker, p. 49). 'Ousia is properly Platonic, while hypostasis, a comparatively modern and rare word, is properly Stoic' (Bigg, *The Christian Platonists*, p. 164). In using the term ὑπόστασις as = οὐσία he was entirely justified by its previous history. It means (1) 'that which settles at the bottom, sediment'; (2) 'anything set under, a support.' From this second meaning two metaphorical uses are derived, 'the groundwork or subject-matter of a thing,' and 'the foundation or ground of hope or confidence, confidence, resolution'; (3) 'subsistence, reality; substance, nature, essence.' From the time of Melito in the East and Tertullian in the West, two substances in the person of Christ had been affirmed. In the Anathemas attached to the Nicene Creed there is the phrase ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας, showing that the terms were then regarded as equivalent, and Athanasius in one of his later writings asserts their identical meaning.

(*b*) In the later decades of the fourth century, however, a new meaning had been imposed on the word *hypostasis* by some of the Greek theologians. They had come to use it as equivalent to *prosopon* for the three 'modes of existence' in the one substance of the Godhead; and this use had found general, but not universal, acceptance. Nestorius himself recognizes it. There is no distinct proof, however, that the term had been used for the person of Christ, as the unity of the Godhead and manhood.

(*c*) Even Cyril is not consistent in his use of the noun *hypostasis*, and the adjective *hypostatic*; and his translator Marius Mercator renders it sometimes 'substantia,' and sometimes 'subsistentia,' but never by the definite *persona*. Probably it served Cyril's purpose to use the ambiguous term, as his own mind wavered between a unity of nature and a unity of person, for Eutyches believed himself to be following in the footsteps of Cyril in his monophysitism. Monophysites regarded φύσις as equal to ὑπόστασις, and so asserted one nature as well as person in Christ: identifying φύσις with ὑπόστασις in the Godhead, some of them landed in tritheism. 'If we regard this hypostatic union,' says Cyril (τὴν καθ' ὑποστάσιν ἕνωσιν), 'either as impossible or unmeet, we fall into the error of making two sons.' To avoid the duality of persons he assumes that the humanity was impersonal. 'Scripture does not say that the Word united to Himself the person (πρόσωπον) of a man, but that "he became flesh."' But οὐκ ἔστι φύσις ἀνυπόστατος—both Nestorius and Monophysites insisted. The Son unchanged 'became partaker of flesh and blood,' 'but even when taking to Himself flesh still remaining what He was.' These sentences would suggest that it was human body the divine Son assumed; but Cyril adds afterwards that 'the holy Body *was* endued with a rational soul' ('The Second Epistle to Nestorius' in *On Faith and the Creed*, pp. 100–101). Our psychology does not allow us, however, to conceive a rational soul that is not personal.

(*d*) Nestorius' objection to Cyril's view of the hypostatic union was that it involved a change and confusion of the divine and the human substance in Christ. The terms *hypostasis* and *ousia* ('subsistentia' and 'substantia'), originally identical in meaning, in course of time came to be used in the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ in different, and even inconsistent, senses. *Ousia* expresses the unity of the Godhead, and *hypostasis* the unity in the person of Christ. *Hypostasis* expresses the trinity in the Godhead, and *ousia* the duality in the person of Christ. In the one case we have three *hypostases* in one *ousia*; in the other two *ousiai* in one *hypostasis*.

(*e*) This discussion of the terms employed shows not only the injustice of the condemnation of Nestorius due to the ambition and rivalry of Cyril rather than to any real divergence from Christian truth; but even more the inadequacy of the metaphysical ideas and terms with which the Creeds attempt to define the nature of the Godhead and the person of Christ. If we attach exactly the same meaning to the word ὑποστάσις or πρόσωπον, 'subsistentia' or 'persona,' in the doctrine of the Trinity as in the doctrine of Christ, we deny the divine

unity. If we give exactly the same meaning to οὐσία or 'substantia' in the doctrine of Christ as in the doctrine of the Trinity, we deny the unity of His person. The Creeds maintain an unstable equilibrium between the unity and the duality of the person of Christ, Christian thought since has tended either towards Nestorianism in its common acceptation or to Eutychianism; Calvinism inclines to the former, and Lutheranism to the latter. The Creed of Chalcedon was only an enforced truce; for it is through and through a theological compromise. A durable peace can be hoped for only, if not only the conclusions, but even the assumptions of the creeds are re-examined, and we can reach categories of thought more adequate to the reality to be interpreted.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Ready, aye Ready.

By the Rev. James Rutherford, B.D., Edinburgh.

'I am ready.'—Rom. i. 15.

This is the motto of one of our old Scottish families. Long ago one of our Scottish kings, James v., was about to advance against the English. He assembled his nobles at Fala, and none of them were willing to follow the Royal Standard with the single exception of Sir John Scott, who said he was ready to serve his king anywhere. King James was so pleased with the loyalty of Sir John Scott that he gave him the right to add a sheaf of spears to his coat of arms and this motto—a sheaf, a bunch of spears, representing a company of armed men, with this word—'Ready, aye Ready.'

If the Apostle Paul had a motto, I think it might have been something like this. In his letters and speeches you come again and again upon this word—'I am ready.' This was just the kind of man Paul was—a quick little man, swift, prompt, prepared, aye ready.

I want to give the motto to the boys and girls to-day. You have gone back to school: you are looking forward to the work of the session, and much farther forward to life. What a splendid thing if you really make this your motto and always say—'Ready!'

You may begin with it early in the morning. When that knock comes to the door, very aggravating it is on a dark winter morning, is this what you say as you jump up quickly—'I'm ready'; or do you say something else, or say nothing at all?

Then perhaps you will get into the habit of being ready; and it will help you all your life. If you keep your eyes open, you will see that there are two kinds of boys—the quick boy and the slow boy. The quick boy has the best of it. Best at his lessons, best at his games. The quick eye, the ready hand, the swift foot—these count for something. And he is best too in life and the work of life when he comes to it.

When all the school-days are done, and the student-days, and the apprentice-days—when you come to the work of life, will you say—'I am ready'? School-days are days for getting ready, and it is a terrible thing to be pushed out to your work when you are not ready for it. Think of the medical student who shirked his work. Everybody wondered how he managed to get through his exams., but he did in a kind of way. Then he was sent to take somebody's practice in the country. One day he was called to a serious case miles away, and when he stood at the bedside he did not know what to do. He went home ashamed, to read up about it when it was too late—home like a beaten hound because he knew that if he had done his work as a student he would never have been helpless that day. Terrible it is to come to your work in life and say, 'Not prepared.'

It is God who gives us our work. Isaiah heard God in the Temple, and said, 'Here am I, send me.' Samuel, the little minister, heard God calling, and said, 'Speak, Lord; for thy servant heareth.' Paul at Damascus heard the voice from heaven, and said, 'What wilt thou have me to do?' They all said, 'Ready!' Our life is like that. Whatever our work may be, building houses or baking bread, writing books or printing books or selling books, a doctor's work or a minister's work, every day it is God who calls, and we should say, 'I am ready.'

Sometimes I wonder if there are any of our boys

and girls who will say what Paul said, 'I am ready to preach the gospel.' What was it that made Paul a missionary? It was a dream he had. One day Paul was at Troas. He did not know what to do, could not see where his work was to be. He went down to the shore to think about it, and sat down on the sand and looked out on the blue Mediterranean. Looking on the shimmering waters in the great heat of the sun, Paul fell asleep. Then in his dream the blue waters of the wide sea came back; and away on the furthest horizon rose the figure of a man; and through the murmur of the waters came the cry, 'Come over and help us.' And Paul said, 'I am ready to preach the gospel.'

So as we look away beyond the seas and think of the millions of men and women and children who do not know what Christ has brought us, there is a voice crying, 'Come and tell us, teach us, help us.' And those who have the spirit of Paul say, 'I am ready to preach the gospel.'

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

Vanity Fair.

The passage concerning Vanity Fair is treated with more originality than we have had of late. They are housed there with Mnason, borrowed from that passage in Ac 21^{16}, 'There went with us also certain of the disciples of Cæsarea and brought with them one Mnason of Cyprus, an old disciple, with whom we should lodge.' The Vanity Fair in which he had his lodging was that Jerusalem to which Paul was so determined to go, against his own safety. The passage and the men are transferred from the New Testament to the *Pilgrim's Progress*, not apparently from the desire to point any new moral, but rather as machinery for quite casual purposes of the narrative. While he lodges them, they discover that there are a few good people in the town of Vanity, just as there have always been saints in the wicked courts of Rome, France, and England. Honest at once desires to meet them, 'But how shall we do to see some of them, for the sight of good men to them that are going on pilgrimage is like the appearing of the moon and the stars to them that are sailing upon the seas.' So we have Contrite, Holy-man, Love-saint, Dare-not-lie, and Penitent invited to the lodging, an interesting counterpart to the list of the names of the jurymen in that same town. The voices of the good men are to the weary pilgrims a kind of sacrament of encouragement and benediction. The conversation moves from point to point with a certain vivacity and freshness which keeps it interesting. The first point on which we may remark is that suggested by Contrite, who tells us that the Fair is so full of hurry as to make an *item* necessary, as a remembrancer for those that live in the midst of its bustle. Persecution, it seems, has stopped, and religion is counted honourable in some parts of the town. Mr. Lecky is no doubt right when he assures us that persecution may be effective, and has often accomplished its purpose of stamping out the thing it hated. Yet human nature is such that after it has gone a certain length persecution becomes distasteful even to the cruel, and so stops itself. So we are told that after their departure when they came to the place where Faithful had been put to death, 'they made a stand, and thanked Him that had enabled him to bear his cross so well; and the rather because they now found that they had a benefit by such a man's sufferings, as his were.'

The best part of the conversation is Mr. Honest's delightful summary of the vicissitudes of pilgrimage, beginning with the sentence, 'It happeneth to us as it happeneth to wayfaring men.' There is a Christian stoicism and independence of fate and circumstances in that passage, not unworthy to be read with Shakespeare's:

> Come what come may,
> Time and the hour survive the roughest day.

or even with Dunbar:

Be merry, man, and tak not sair in mind
The wavering of this wretchit warld of sorrow;
To God be humble and to thy friend be kind,
And with thy nichtbours gladly lend and borrow;
His chance to-nicht, it may be thine to-morrow;
Be blythe in heart for any adventúre,
For oft with wise men it has been said aforrow
Without gladness availeth no treasure.

There is a good deal of general talk about pilgrimage, in which Holy-man insists upon courage and an unspotted life as the chief requisites for successful pilgrims, and Dare-not-lie, in a striking passage, describes those who are ill-dressed and careless, 'to the disparagement of their Lord.' Here is John Bunyan's old point of honour. The great motive for seemliness is the same as the motive for Holiness, and indeed for all other virtues, and it raises the ordinary decencies and good manners of life into the same high religious light as that which shines upon the noblest and most heroic virtues. The stay is prolonged, and they get to know many people of the Fair. The further marriages of Samuel and Joseph to two of Mnason's daughters, and the continual labour of Mercy among the poor, together with the coming of little children to the young married couples, more or less conventionalize the allegory. Along with this account of the prolonged stay in Vanity Fair, it is worth while to read Nathaniel Hawthorne's, and that of the pilgrim in Part Three, by way of contrast.

The most novel and curious feature of the whole narrative is the story of a monster that comes out of the woods and feeds upon young children. It is very difficult to tell what Bunyan had in his mind when he wrote this. Doubtless, the suggestion came ultimately out of old romances, such as those of St. George and the Dragon, or Beowulf and the Grendel. There seems to be some hidden meaning in it, which gives it a purpose further than that of breaking the monotony of the tale, for this monster had the habit of carrying off the children of the townsfolk and rearing them as its own, and it was governed by a woman. It has been supposed that some covert reference was made to the Great Plague in 1666, while, on the other hand, the Scarlet Woman might be suggested and the ravages of the Church of Rome upon the younger generation. Perhaps, however, it is simply some evil custom which Bunyan has in mind, such as drunkenness or the vanities of fashionable life, or the lusts of the flesh. In any case, they did not kill the monster, but were able only to watch for him and continually assault him so that he became wounded and lame, and was unable to work so much havoc. Preaching and agitating and publicity lessen many evils which they cannot end, and this seems to be indicated in a general way here.

So it came to pass that even in Vanity Fair the Christians became popular with all but with some of the baser sort; and the average citizens, though they 'wanted their taste of things, yet had a reverent esteem and respect for them.' It is, of course, common experience that the philanthropic side of a Christianity is often appreciated where there is no taste whatever for its spiritual aspect, but it says a great deal for John Bunyan that he remembered this and included it in his allegory. An evangelist less in touch with human nature would have been more uncompromising in his condemnation of the world of human life around him, and would have counted it dangerous to admit as much as Bunyan has done of natural virtue to the inhabitants of Vanity Fair. One remembers Thackeray's and Meredith's pictures of the world in their great novels, and the more we experience of life the less absolute becomes our judgment of worldly hearts. Even these citizens are not utterly bad people after all. Beneath all their folly and even cruelty, there are buried feelings of good, which can be and often have been awakened, and their daily life has in it many elements of simple human kindness and virtue which cannot be overlooked in forming a general estimate of things. Even when the pilgrims departed they left behind them in Vanity Fair, saints, as well as sinners.

The Further Journey.

For a time we are still glancing at the incidents and objects to which we were introduced in Part One. The Mine of Demas has no temptations or allurements for these pilgrims. They are rich enough for their necessities, and their travelling expenses are few, so that the temptation of lucre affects them only with astonishment, qualified by remembrance of the common fact of human nature, that people are generally little moved by the 'harms that others have met with, especially if that thing upon which they look has as an attract-

ing virtue upon the foolish eye.' With that commentary upon By-ends and Lot's Wife, they pass on their way.

The pastoral beauty of the riverside and the meadows leads to one of the most idyllic passages which Bunyan ever wrote, with its description of the children's home, and the man that gathered these lambs with His arm and carried them in His bosom. For human tenderness and exquisiteness of poetic feeling it will be difficult to surpass this great paragraph.

Doubting Castle.

Readers of Robert Louis Stevenson's essay on the *Pilgrim's Progress* will remember Miss Ennice Bagster's famous little woodcut of the demolition of Doubting Castle, in which we see the great keep split from top to bottom, and tumbling in a most monstrous ruin. This is the next incident to which the pilgrims come, and it is not approached without hesitation. The question is raised, whether it be right to venture upon the ground of Doubting Castle even for the purpose of demolishing it: and Great-heart, with characteristic daring, says that he feels that he has a commandment, and must run the risk. No such commandment, however, has been given to the women, nor to Feeble-mind, nor Ready-to-Halt. They do not involve themselves in this exploit further than to sit upon the road and keep guard there. All are safe, though so near to Doubting Castle. 'They keeping in the road a little child might lead them.' In this ingenious way Bunyan has touched upon a question which is vital in every age, and which is singularly appropriate in our own. Doubts are all around us, and there are some who are afraid to venture upon the ground, or to think about the questions which agitate their times at all.' It is a touch of fine spiritual genius that decides the question in each case as Bunyan does. The questions are there and earnest society always contains a religious clique of believers who stay safely in the road and take no part in the questions which perplex the growing number of their neighbours and their children. Thank God there are always others who feel that they have a commandment, and who are prepared to venture any risk that may befall them in regard to their own faith if so be that they may rescue some of the persons of despair and the victims of doubt.

The story here becomes a most vivacious battle-piece. Giant Despair is clad in a breastplate of fire, like the Nessus-shirt of Heracles, and comes to meet them in all his formidable and terrifying strength. After a tough battle he is slain, and his wife, Diffidence, also perishes. It is significant that Diffidence is cut down by Honest. She stands for that habit of doubt to which reference has already been frequently made. It is not definite intellectual perplexities that are here intended, but a kind of lethargy and paralysis of faith. A greater champion than Honest is required to cut down Despair, who must be fought with the choicest spiritual and intellectual weapons of the Christian armoury. But the vague habit of unbelief is a thing which needs only honest treatment, for there is dishonesty and intellectual insincerity in entertaining doubts which one does not bring to a focus, and all that is needed in such cases is honesty to face the questions which in their vague uncertainty seems so much more formidable than they really are.

The ghastly picture of the victims of Despair is one which none who reads is likely to forget. How many dead are there!—the suicides and the dead souls of the centuries, whose memory must affect every thinking and compassionate spirit. Some, however, are not dead yet. Despondency almost starved to death, and Much-afraid, his daughter, are still not beyond the reach of salvation; and Bunyan is so glad about that that he lets his own merry human nature go, and gives us a dancing scene which contrasts very curiously with his own early scruples about bell ringing and such sports. Nothing could be more delicious than Christiana and Mercy playing upon the violin and the lute, and Mr. Ready-to-Halt, hand in hand with Despondency's daughter, dancing with his crutch, while the girl answers the music handsomely. Lest, however, any one should presume upon such hilarity, he feels it necessary to close this scene with a warning; and in the rather uncouth rhymes which he writes upon the marble stone, he hints that though Doubting Castle be demolished, and Giant Despair has lost his head, yet sin can rebuild the castle and Giant Despair can come to life again.

Literature.

THE PHILOCALIA OF ORIGEN.[1]

In view of the exceptionally fragmentary and imperfect form in which Origen's works have come down to us, all new light on the life and work of the great Alexandrian is especially welcome. Our best English guide on the subject is Westcott's exhaustive article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, along with his essay in *Religious Thought in the West*. There is an excellent essay in R. A. Vaughan's *Essays and Remains*. Origen's work *Against Celsus* and what is left of his *First Principles* are translated in the 'Ante-Nicene Library' (Clark). As far as we know, the work named above is the first English translation of a singularly interesting anthology of quotations from Origen drawn up by Basil of Cæsarea and Gregory of Nazianzus in the fourth century (a century after Origen). The quotations are selected from Origen's Homilies, Commentaries, and Treatises, some of which have since perished or survive only in the Latin version of Rufinus. The anthology is interesting as a proof that, despite the hatred which pursued Origen and his teaching even in his grave, he did not lack friends and admirers among the best Christian scholars. And still more it serves as a key to the tenor and spirit of his writings. Like Clement, his master, he represents the union between philosophy and faith for which Alexandria was famous, while English readers will have an opportunity of noting the sanity and sobriety of judgment which was often lacking in writers of the Alexandrian School.

An instance of the latter feature is the way in which he treats the allegorical method of which Alexandria was the home. We know the lengths to which this method was carried during the centuries of its reign. In the extracts given in the *Philocalia*, it is advocated as a means of explaining difficulties of style and matter both in the Old Testament and the New. The literal sense is often viewed merely as the vehicle of spiritual 'mysteries' or truths. Whether the primary sense is accepted or not is not always clear. We are not told what the higher truths are or how they are to be found. In some instances there is a striking modernity in the explanations, as in reference to the Creation account. Still, whether we agree or not, we must recognize the serious purpose in view and the good sense with which it is worked out. Everything petty or ridiculous is conspicuously absent.

Another burning question—that of free will—is discussed repeatedly in the same practical way. The question was prominent in the East, and was more earnestly answered in the affirmative than in the West. The case on which argument against Scripture was based by Celsus and others was that of Pharaoh; and certainly, so far as the letter goes there is reason for the objection. Eschewing metaphysics, Origen argues by analogy and illustration. The objector believes, at least, that God is just; but if God punishes evil of which He is the cause, He is unjust, which is utterly contrary to Scripture. As the action of the sun varies with the substance it falls on, so God's goodness hardens where it does not persuade. As a physician does not always try to cure at first, but has to bring the malady to a head, so God must often indirectly aggravate the disease He seeks to remedy. It is a sign of Origen's mild and tolerant temper that He interprets the divine action as seeking even Pharaoh's good. 'The question, How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me? is intended to shame Pharaoh, because if he did not humble himself, it was not that he could not, but that he would not.' The difference in destiny is due to willingness or unwillingness in us. There is no need for God to harden the unwilling heart. To make God's foreknowledge the cause of what is foreknown is to reverse the real order.

It is no mean distinction that the analogy drawn by Origen between nature and Scripture in regard to the problems common to both proved the seed-corn of Butler's great treatise (p. 33).

The work includes a beautiful letter of Origen to Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of Neocæsarea, whom he addresses as 'my good lord and most reverend son.' He urges Gregory to treat science and philosophy as a preparation for Christianity, and ingeniously suggests that the spoils obtained by the Israelites from the Egyptians furnished the adornments for the first tabernacle of worship. In his reading of the divine Scriptures, Gregory is

[1] *The Philocalia of Origen*, translated into English by the Rev. George Lewis, M.A., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1911. 7s. 6d. net.

to 'knock and seek in the right way and with unfaltering faith in God the meaning of the divine writings, which is hidden from the many. Be not content, however, with knocking and seeking; for prayer is the most necessary qualification for the understanding of divine things.'

Leeds. J. S. BANKS.

CRISPI.

Nearly half a century has passed away since Garibaldi was received in this country with an enthusiasm never excited either before or since by the citizen of any foreign state. Probably no successful general in our own country, not even the great Duke himself, has aroused the feelings of our people as they were stirred by the presence in London of General Garibaldi, the liberator of Sicily and Naples.

In *The Memoirs of Francesco Crispi* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2 vols., 32s. net) we have the story of an exile from his native Sicily, who, along with Garibaldi, became one of the makers of modern Italy, and one of the earliest of her Prime Ministers.

Driven into exile while yet a young man, Francesco Crispi found it impossible to earn a living either in London or in Paris. But he did not despair either of his own future or of the future of his native land. He had the patriotic tide, that Burns tells us 'streamed through Wallace's undaunted heart.' He became one of 'the thousand' that sailed from Genoa, with Garibaldi at their head, to the relief of Sicily. 'Revolutions are not made with rose-water.' They need rifles and ammunition, and Garibaldi's expedition was not too well provided with either. But if ever 'gunpowder and glory' went together in doing good, it was in the outcome of what seemed a mad enterprise. Though Crispi was no soldier, yet he was one of Garibaldi's right-hand men in administration and diplomacy; and when the sword had done its work there was much diplomacy required, of which we have a full record in the first of these volumes. Thus the returned exile became one of the deliverers and saviours of his country. Crispi's dream was of a united Italy under Victor Emmanuel, and it was realized in 1871, when the overthrow of France in the Franco-German War left the Papal States with no defence against the Italian troops.

The second and more important of these volumes is entitled *The Triple Alliance.* It records what was once the secret history of the still existing offensive and defensive alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy, in the formation of which Crispi played a leading part. The course of international diplomacy never did run smooth or straight, and its tortuous ways are clearly manifest in these pages. There was at first no love lost between Austria and Italy, and even Bismarck either would not, or could not, play his part as 'the honest brother' between them. We have here full and interesting records of Crispi's first interview with the German Chancellor, at which the alliance was frankly put forward. But Crispi was resolute that Austria must not have Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Bismarck was as decided that it was no part of his business to mention the subject to Austria. He proferred the suggestion that Italy might have another slice of Turkey. The result was that Austria got all she wanted, and Italy got nothing. Curiously enough, some years later, when France had decided to seize Tunis, and Crispi was protesting in every quarter, it was Lord Salisbury who said she might have Tripoli if only she would wait, and now Italy is waging war against Turkey for the territory she was 'offered' long ago.

There is an interesting narrative of Crispi's visit to Bismarck in his own home in 1887. The Italian statesman wrote in the German Chancellor's album: 'In this sanctuary of patriotism, where vigil is kept for the maintenance of the peace of Europe, I leave a memory.' We are told that this thought gave much satisfaction to the Prince, who said in a serious tone: 'Your Excellency has read my intentions aright. I labour for the maintenance of peace. I live for that alone. We have done enough for war; now let us work together for peace.' It was on the same occasion that this man of peace, speculating on the probability of war between Russia and Germany, took comfort in the fact that Germany could put three millions of soldiers in the field, and had arms, uniforms, and everything necessary for them. He did not live to see and did not foresee Russia stricken and smitten in the Far East and her fleet destroyed in the Sea of Japan. Signor Crispi was not far wrong in saying that a year and half is longer than any one can see ahead in the tortuous courses of diplomacy.

SWIFT'S CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. F. Elrington Ball, Litt.D., has now issued the third and last volume of his edition of *The*

Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D. (G. Bell & Sons; 3 vols., 8vo, 10s. 6d. net each). It is a surprise in literature. For this edition was undertaken by one man and carried out by another, yet it is the best edition of Swift's Correspondence. It was undertaken by Mr. Caesar Litton Falkiner, who was known to be well furnished for the purpose; and it was carried out, on his death, by Mr. Elrington Ball, who had to prove his capacity for it; and yet it is not only the best edition of Swift's Correspondence, but such an edition as is likely to remain the standard for all time to come.

'Besides a very great increase in the Correspondence, a comparison of the present edition with that of Sir Walter Scott will show that there are few letters included in his edition which appear in this one without some alteration. As will be seen from the frequency with which his name is quoted as the authority, Sheridan has been found the editor whose work evinces the greatest care, and there is reason to think that he had means no longer in existence of correcting the text given by his predecessors. The most extraordinary view of the duties of an editor was taken by Faulkner, and solecisms, which Sheridan noticed and corrected, arose not infrequently from Faulkner's confidence that he could improve what came from even the pen of Swift. For instance, the use in the third person singular of verbs of the termination *th*, to which Sheridan calls attention, is not generally found in Swift's autograph letters, and appears to have been due to Faulkner.'

After mentioning the sources, six in all, which have been used to correct and augment the previous editions, the editor says: 'The present edition is the first in which any extensive annotation has been attempted. Faulkner and Hawkesworth dropped here and there a note containing an observation of a most obvious kind, or information that would be known to almost any reader. Sheridan inserted pedantic criticisms of Swift's grammar and construction. Nichols added only such knowledge as he had gained in the compilation of his noble "History of Leicestershire," and Sir Walter Scott is responsible for some platitudes which there is good ground to believe were the work of an assistant. But this failure to explain the references in the letters is at least as much attributable to inability as to reluctance to undertake the toil. Apart from the countless books which the press of to-day brings to their aid, workers in the present age are too apt to forget that to their predecessors the Public Record Offices of England and Ireland, and the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, were not even a dream.'

Swift's continued popularity is due to several causes. They are admirably described in the Introduction to the first volume. That Introduction has been written by the Bishop of Ossory, Dr. J. H. Bernard, who, when himself Dean of St. Patrick's, did so much for the study of Swift and for the solution of the controversies that have gathered round his name. Two things Dr. Bernard lays special emphasis upon—Swift's sincerity and Swift's style. And the present generation will seek no other reason.

With this issue of the Correspondence, there are now satisfactory editions of all Swift's works. For already we have received from the same publishers Temple Scott's edition of the Prose Works in twelve volumes, and Ernst Browning's edition of the Poems in two volumes. These are in small post 8vo, and no doubt the Correspondence will appear in that form in process of time. But in the meantime this is the only edition, and it can never be quite superseded. For its illustrations, were there nothing else, will always give it unique value.

A Chronicle of the Popes (Bell & Sons; 7s. 6d. net). How have we been able to get along without it? By laboriously working through Ranke, Creighton, Luchaire, and all the rest of the books which contain the history of *some* of the Popes; or else by yet more laboriously consulting the Dictionaries and Encyclopædias on each of the Popes by name. This is a Chronicle of all the Popes from St. Peter (if he was a Pope) to Pius X., in one handy volume. And Mr. A. E. McKilliam, the author of the book, has contrived to make it a readable record. Pope after Pope stands before us in his individuality as each short chapter is read. And that is the greater achievement inasmuch as this is not a biographical but an historical work. The Popes are here; here also are their acts; and here in some measure are the causes and the consequences of them and of their acts.

It is not very long since there was published a good introduction to the study of ballads, by Professor Gummere. The success of that book has

encouraged the editors of the 'Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature' to include in their series a shorter but not less attractive or authoritative introduction by Mr. T. F. Henderson. The title is *The Ballad in Literature* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 1s. net).

Captain F. W. O. Maycock, D.S.O., whose volume on *Napoleon's European Campaigns* came as a surprise of clever condensation, has now issued a fuller account of *The Napoleonic Campaign of 1805* (Gale & Polden; 3s. 6d. net). The book is well furnished with maps, which it will not often be necessary to consult, so clear is the narrative throughout.

The Rev. Augustus Hopkins Strong, D.D., LL.D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary, U.S.A., has been teaching in that seminary for forty years. Besides his lectures, he has delivered many addresses and sermons during that time, and he has written many essays. All these addresses, sermons, and essays—or at least all that he thought worth preserving—he has gathered together now and published in two large handsome volumes, of five hundred octavo pages each, under the title of *Miscellanies* (Philadelphia, The Griffith & Rowland Press; $1 each).

The first volume, he says, is 'chiefly historical.' Perhaps it is. There are at any rate historical addresses in it, and even historical sermons. There is an address on the future of the Baptists in America, under the title of 'Our Denominational Outlook'; and there is a sermon on the past of the Baptists in America, under the title of 'Our Fathers' Faith and its Lessons for To-day.' But there are also addresses on 'Theology and Literature,' on 'The Element of Justice in War,' on 'The Omnipresent Christ,' and on 'Timelessness in Man and in God.' Are they historical? Nor altogether historical, though there is history in them, are the papers read to various clubs on 'The Roman Wall in Britain,' 'The Châteaux of France,' and 'Rome, Old and New.' But all these sermons, addresses, and papers serve one and the same purpose. They show that the President of the Rochester Theological Seminary has many interests, and can write with interest on them all. Whatever you say about the opinions of President Strong, you always say that he makes you listen to him.

The second volume, he tells us, is 'chiefly theological.' It is, in fact, a volume of sermons. There are three articles or lectures to begin with—on Schleiermacher, Ezekiel Gilman Robinson, and Degeneration; and there are thirteen very short addresses to end with; but the rest are sermons.

And the sermons are the best of the volumes, and will be the life of them. The rest, being mostly mundane knowledge, will vanish away. But the sermons will remain. For, while they are as literary as the addresses, and their message is sent home by a well-chosen incident or poem, that message is always the Cross of Christ, the power of God unto salvation.

Under the title of *The Greatest English Classic*, Dr. Cleland Boyd McAfee has published a study of the Authorized Version (Harper). Dr. McAfee is full of enthusiasm for the 'King James Version,' as he calls it, but his book scarcely deserves the name of study. No doubt it is purposely written in a popular style. It was originally delivered as a series of popular lectures at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. But popularity is no proper synonym for inaccuracy. On the contrary, the less opportunity our readers have of testing our statements, the more careful we should be in making them. But it must be confessed that Dr. McAfee is often very loose, sometimes incredibly inaccurate. He explains the phrase 'all to break his skull' in this way. 'When the King James translators wrote that, they used the word "alto," which is evidently the beginning of "altogether," or wholly or utterly, and what they meant was that she threw the stone and utterly broke his skull.' Certainly that was what they meant, but that is not how they obtained their meaning.

The Rev. L. MacLean Watt, M.A., B.D., has prepared an order of service for Presbyterian Churches, and called it *The Minister's Manual* (Edinburgh: Henderson; 2s. 6d. net).

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published *An Index to Expositions of Holy Scripture, by Alexander Maclaren, D.D., LL.D.* (7s. 6d.). The compiler is the Rev. George Eayrs, F.R.Hist.S. It is a surprise to find the texts mixed up with the subjects; it would have been more convenient if they had been arranged separately. Otherwise

everything seems in order. The volume has been printed and bound in uniformity with the series.

A volume of addresses to children, written by the Rev. Frederick Humphrey, has been published by Messrs. Hunter & Longhurst (1s. 6d. net). As the title is *Pins and Needles*, it is proper to say that the addresses are pointed. They are also short and very unconventional.

Deuteronomy: Its Place in Revelation, is the title of a volume by the Rev. A. H. McNeile, D.D., Fellow and Dean of Sidney-Sussex College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). Last year the S.P.C.K. published a book by the Rev. J. S. Griffiths under the title of *The Problem of Deuteronomy*. Dr. McNeile's volume is an answer to that book. It is an effective answer, the more effective that it is so forbearing. For example: In order to prove that Deuteronomy is the work of Moses, Mr. Griffiths asserts that it contains many archaic expressions. His words are, it 'abounds in archaisms.' Whereupon he abbreviates a list of its archaisms which he found in the *Pulpit Commentary* on Deuteronomy. Now the *Pulpit Commentary* took its list from Delitzsch's *Commentary on Genesis*, using the fourth edition, which appeared in 1872. But in his *New Commentary on Genesis*, published in 1887, Delitzsch abandoned the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, and with it his entire list of archaisms, with one single exception.

But Dr. McNeile's volume is more than an answer to Mr. Griffiths. Professor Driver, who writes a 'Foreword' to it, says that it 'contains a lucid exposition of the contents and scope of Deuteronomy, and of the place taken by it in the history of revelation.' And this is at present the very best service that any book could render us.

Mr. Leighton Pullan, Fellow and Tutor of S. John Baptist's College, Oxford, has contributed to the 'Oxford Library of Practical Theology' a volume on *The Gospels* (Longmans; 5s.). The volume has in its favour the attractive outward appearance which has given distinction to the series, and it may need that advantage in order to give it a start. For we have had very many books on the Gospels within the last year or two, and some of them are very good books. This, however, is in our opinion the best book that Mr. Pullan has written, and it will take its place among the best books that have been written on the Gospels.

The author's critical position will be understood if we say that it is practically that of Dr. Sanday. Dr. Sanday's influence is felt throughout the book. But that is not to say that it is an influence which has in any degree repressed the author's own individuality. On the contrary, it has stimulated it. This, indeed, is the effect of Dr. Sanday's influence always, so open is he himself to every ray of light that may come, no matter what quarter it comes from. There are one or two slight inaccuracies, which will have to be attended to when a second edition is called for.

Either you must buy all the books of the late Professor William James or else you must buy none of them. For they are inseparably connected with one another by cross-references. It is that system of cross-references that has compelled—yes, compelled—the publication of another book. Thus in *The Meaning of Truth* (p. 127), he says, 'This statement is probably excessively obscure to any one who has not read my two articles "Does Consciousness Exist?" and "A World of Pure Experience."' The reader who turned to find these two articles could not find them; they had never been published. They have been published now, together with other ten articles, under the title of *Essays in Radical Empiricism* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net).

But there is another reason for the publication of this book. Professor James was both a Pragmatist and a Radical Empiricist. And these two things, he said himself, were wholly independent of one another. 'Let me say that there is no logical connexion between pragmatism, as I understand it, and a doctrine which I have recently set forth as "radical empiricism." The latter stands on its own feet.' Now we know where to find William James the pragmatist. The radical empiricist can be found, if found at all, in this book.

May we know what radical empiricism is? We may at least read what Professor James himself says it is. 'I say "empiricism," because it is contented to regard its most assured conclusions concerning matters of fact as hypotheses liable to modification in the course of future experience; and I say "radical," because it treats the doctrine of monism itself as an hypothesis, and, unlike so

much of the halfway empiricism that is current under the name of positivism or agnosticism or scientific naturalism, it does not dogmatically affirm monism as something with which all experience has got to square.'

A short memorial of *Herbert Kynaston*, at one time Headmaster of Cheltenham College, has been written by the Rev. E. D. Stone (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). Short as it is, even very short, it gives one quite a good account of a man who was a man indeed, earnest and sincere. The selections that have been made from his occasional writings, light and humorous as they mostly are, do not blur but fill in the picture. Take this contribution to a vexed question:

DEBÓRAH *v.* DÉBORAH

Our J.T.F. pronounces it Debórah,
For those who call her Déborah a floorer;
And, to regard the Hebrew points as he doth,
Should not her husband's name be called
Lapídoth?

Mr. Percy S. P. Handcock, M.A., has found a new use for 'that blessed word Mesopotamia.' He has written an Introduction to the Archæology of Babylonia and Assyria, and, feeling the awkwardness of using two names for one stretch of country, he has called his book *Mesopotamian Archæology* (Macmillan; 8vo, pp. xvi+423, 12s. 6d. net). The book is furnished with a coloured frontispiece, 32 plates in half-tone, and many illustrations in line, together with two maps on one sheet.

Well, it is not the first book that Sir Henry Layard has been the occasion of. His own fascinating volumes are fascinating still. And they have been the quarry for many a popular book which followed them. But there has been much discovery in the Mesopotamian plain since Layard, as Hilprecht has already made us know. Mr. Handcock is not the first, but he is the latest, and being latest he has gathered together all that the spades of his predecessors brought to light and has arranged it in sections, showing a complete mastery of the material, together with great skilfulness in its description.

The discoveries in Babylonia and Assyria have obtained their reputation from their association with the Bible. The student of the Bible knows how intense is the interest to be found in them. But he has never realized how enormous is the mass of material now available for the use of the historian and the antiquarian. There are few departments of knowledge that are left unvisited. Architecture, Sculpture, Metallurgy, Painting, Engraving, Pottery, Dress—each has a chapter of its own, with many illustrations; and besides these there is one long chapter under the comprehensive title of 'Life, Manners, Customs, Law, Religion.' The book ends with a short bibliography, a list of kings and rulers, and a serviceable index.

Under the auspices of the Methodist Branch of the Laymen's Missionary Movement in Victoria, a volume has been published which contains a history of the work already accomplished for Christ in the islands of the Pacific, its present position, and its future prospects. This opportune service has been rendered by the Rev. J. W. Burton of Fiji. It is a small book, but it is packed with well-mastered information. From its clever title, *The Call of the Pacific* (2s. net), to its comprehensive map, everything is workmanlike.

Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier are the publishers of a volume of services for public worship, sacramental and other occasions, which has been prepared by the Rev. Hugh George Watt, D.D. The title is *The Sacraments and Prayer* (2s. 6d. net).

The easy-going argument for Christian Science is that 'there must be something in it.' The Rev. T. H. Wright, of the Church of Scotland in Dresden, has studied the whole subject and he can find nothing in it. His little book, *Christian Science: Its Teaching and Practice in the Light of Christianity* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 1s. net), is from beginning to end an astonished and astonishing exposition of mental confusion and moral impotence.

Mr. F. W. Grant has written a book on *Genesis in the Light of the New Testament* (Pickering & Inglis; 1s. net). It is only in the light of the New Testament that we can ever look at Genesis now, but Mr. Grant does so deliberately and absorbingly, not being the least afraid to find prophecy in the one and fulfilment in the other.

The same publishers have issued a second edition of Mr. Ernest Dowsett's little book *The Women who walked with Jesus* (1s. net).

A volume of daily readings from the works of the Rev. J. R. Miller, D.D., has been issued from the Pilgrim Press. Its title is *The Shining Life* (2s. 6d. net).

From the Pilgrim Press there comes also 'a scheme of lessons correlating civics with religious instruction,' under the title of *Good Citizenship* (1s. 6d. net). The author is Mr. W. D. Bavin. It is the application to a special topic of Mr. Bavin's very practical method of imparting instruction, a method which has been tested by long personal experience.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians has been edited for Mr. Buckland's 'Devotional Commentary,' by Canon R. B. Girdlestone (R.T.S.; 2s.). In respect of criticism Canon Girdlestone follows Sir William Ramsay. But criticism is not understood to enter much into this series. It is a devotional commentary, and to Canon Girdlestone at any rate, 'devotional' is practically equivalent to 'expository and evangelical.'

Mr. Edward A. Marshall has written a story founded on the Book of Jonah. It is quite a good example of this kind of fiction, which never has been or can be altogether successful. But Mr. Marshall is fortunate in having a wife who can illustrate his book, and by her illustrations lift it clean out of the ordinary and the commonplace. The title is *Jonah of Gath-Hepher* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net).

Professor Herbert L. Willett of the University of Chicago has published a volume of sermons to which he has given the title *The Call of the Christ* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). The complaint is made of some preachers that they never mention Christ. Professor Willett never mentions anything else. The name is found in the title of every one of the sermons. The first sermon is called 'The Audacity of Christ'; the second 'The Call of the Christ' (that sermon giving its title to the book); the third is called 'The Authority of Christ'; and so we pass to the last three, which are 'The Patriotism of Christ,' 'The Uniqueness of Christ,' and 'The Perennial Christ.' What is Professor Willett's attitude to Christ? It is the attitude of love, the love of a scholar who has been redeemed with His precious blood.

If you read the *Pacific Monthly* or the *North American Review*, you know the name of Kiyoshi K. Kawakami. For in these periodicals Mr. Kawakami has recently had some articles. And if the name did not arrest your attention, the articles were bound to do so. Mr. Kawakami is greatly concerned about the cool relations that now exist between Japan and America. He believes that this coolness is due to misunderstanding. The misunderstanding has arisen over three different questions: The Manchuria question, the Korean question, and the emigration question. He believes that on all these questions Americans have misunderstood the aims of Japan and misinterpreted her actions; and he wrote these articles, which, along with some others, he has now gathered into a handsome volume, for the purpose of showing the Americans that they are in the wrong. 'It is time that America should conduct herself in a manner that becomes the power, wealth, and culture that inhere in her. It is time that Americans should awaken to the grave situation which cannot fail to result if they persist in playing the *rôle* of a *provocateur*—unless, forsooth, they are really anxious to create a *casus belli*. These are plain words, but I say them in the name of international deportment, peace and amity.' The title of the book is *American-Japanese Relations* (Revell; 7s. 6d. net).

On the whole, one is struck with the fairness of Mr. Kawakami's defence of his country. He admits, for example, that the Japanese did not always treat the natives of Korea well at the beginning of the Japanese occupation. 'Many adventurers and speculators and other undesirable characters came to the peninsula from Japan, all expecting to fish in troubled waters. The worst of these people were, perhaps, money-lenders and low-class laborers. The natural thriftlessness of the Koreans, coupled with a childish pride in actually possessing large sums of money, furnished eminently suitable traits upon which the unscrupulous usurer could build a thriving business. His favourite method was to loan money upon rice-fields in sums much below the actual value of the land. These loans bore high interest and were made for short periods; when the debtor failed to

pay on the fixed date, the creditor lost no time in foreclosing the mortgage.

'Not less reprehensible was the conduct of low-class laborers. Puffed up by the notion that their country vanquished one of the greatest military powers of Europe, they vented their arrogance and their contempt for the Koreans by bullying and bluster. They apparently believed that they were, by right of conquest, entitled to handle their native neighbours as they pleased. It never dawned upon them that their acts were calculated to hinder the good work of the residency-general by alienating the sympathy of the natives as well as of foreign nations. Had it not been for the detestable conduct of this riffraff, Japanese rule in Korea would not have been made the target of scathing criticisms.'

Whether or not there is in this country any wide-spread interest in the mysteries, or in any kind of esoteric knowledge, will be put to the test by the publication in English of Edouard Schuré's great work. The book now published in two volumes in an English translation by Mr. Fred Rothwell, B.A., under the title of *The Great Initiates* (Rider; 7s. 6d. net), has been appearing in fragments during the last seven years. And on the whole it is good for its reputation that it has appeared so. For the subject is off the ordinary lines either of youthful education or of adult interest; and to accept it or even to understand it takes some time and patience and some collateral reading. If one were simply in a hurry to find out whether there is anything in it, or to confirm an already formed opinion that there is nothing in it, one should begin with the last division, which is entitled 'Jesus, the Last Great Initiate.' It does not seem at all likely that one who reads that division first will read any more of the book. But it is not certain that that method will be fair to the author or even to oneself. Initiation into mysteries occupies a very large place in the history of the religion of the world, and is in itself a subject demanding reverent and patient study. It is therefore not altogether impossible that some progress in that study might furnish even the student of the Gospels with the means of discovering elements in the life and person of Jesus that are true though otherwise undetected. Let us begin, therefore, with the introductory chapter on 'Esoteric Teaching,' and from that pass through Rama, Krishna, Hermes, Moses, Orpheus, Pythagoras, Plato, and so come at last to Jesus.

Professor Arthur Drews, Ph.D., of Carlsruhe, has gained for himself quite a name, however long it may last him, by denying the historical existence of Jesus, and has reached the glory of having his books translated into English. The latest translation is made by Mr. Joseph McCabe; the title of the book in English is *The Witnesses to the Historicity of Jesus* (Watts; 6s. net).

How does a man with such a task before him go to work? One of the things that appeal to him is the fact that Jesus has left no personal writings behind Him. 'As to the existence of Luther, Frederick the Great, Goethe, or Bismarck, we have not only documents from their own hand, the genuineness of which is not open to question, but masses of evidence on the part of contemporaries. All this is wanting in the case of Jesus. He has not left behind a single line. He has, as Jülicher says, "written in the sand," and there is not a single reliable document to enable us to trust the gospels, from which alone we learn something about his life. It is, therefore, just as permissible to doubt as to admit the existence of such a person; and it is an unhappy indication of the superficiality and loose thinking of our time that even leaders of science have not hesitated to bring into the field to prove the historicity of Jesus this foolish reference to historical personalities.' One thinks here of Socrates, who also 'has not left behind a single line.' Does Professor Drews deny *his* existence?

But, now, notice in that quotation the phrase 'the gospels, from which alone we learn something about his life.' Do we learn nothing whatever from the Epistles? Professor Drews disposes of the Epistles in the same way as he disposes of the Gospels. There is, for example, that very important passage in 1 Co 11^{23}, which tells of the institution of the Eucharist. What will Professor Drews do with that? He will simply use with it the same argument as he finds successful in every other instance in which an historical fact or statement stands in his way. He will not bring forward other facts or statements which are opposed to it; he will simply argue on *a priori* grounds that it cannot possibly be true. After asserting that 'the mysticism of the festive supper cannot have been instituted by Jesus, but is based on the cult of the Christian community, and was subsequently put in

the mouth of its supposed founder,' he proceeds to 'examine the passage more closely.' This is how he proceeds—

'"The same night in which he was betrayed"—*was* he betrayed? The thing is historically so improbable, the whole story of the betrayal is so absurd historically and psychologically, that only a few thoughtless Bible-readers can accept it with complacency. Imagine the ideal man Jesus knowing that one of his disciples is about to betray him and thus forfeit his eternal salvation, yet doing nothing to restrain the miserable man, but rather confirming him in it! Imagine a Judas demanding money from the high-priest for the betrayal of a man who walks the streets of Jerusalem daily, and whose sojourn at night could assuredly be discovered without any treachery! "For Judas to have betrayed Jesus," Kautsky says, "is much the same as if the Berlin police were to pay a spy to point out to them the man named Bebel." Moreover, the Greek word *paradidonai* does not mean "betray" at all, but "give up," and is simply taken from Is 53^{12}, where it is said that the servant of God "gave himself unto death." The whole story of the betrayal is a late invention founded on that passage in the prophet, and Judas is not an historical personality, but, as Robertson believes, a representative of the Jewish people, hated by the Christians, who were believed to have caused the death of the Saviour. Further, the "night," in which the betrayal is supposed to have taken place, has no historical background. It merely serves to set in contrast the luminous figure of Jesus and the dark work of his betrayer. Hence Paul cannot have known anything of a nocturnal betrayal on the part of Judas, and one more "proof" of the historicity of Jesus breaks down.'

Sir Harry Johnston's new book is like a haggis, somewhat confused feeding. A little patience, however, brings method out of the apparent chaos. Sir Harry Johnston is an anthropologist, and his interest is not in individuals but in races. The book is accordingly found to contain a series of anthropological studies in race development, three races being specially chosen for study—the Irish, the German, and the North African. The title of the book is *Views and Reviews* (Williams & Norgate; 3s. 6d. net).

There has been a good deal of discussion lately about the Pharisees. Jewish scholars, especially those of the liberal school of Mr. Montefiore, have charged the New Testament writers with misinterpretation, and their charge has been listened to by Christian scholars with patience and sometimes with considerable sympathy. And now at last a book entitled *Pharisaism* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net) has been written by Mr. R. Travers Herford, B.A., which goes beyond anything yet attempted in the way of sympathy with the Jewish complaint. It is not an easy matter to deal with, and Mr. Herford has not found it so. He is not, however, so much troubled as some of us would be with that which is the central difficulty. For to him, to whom Jesus is 'simply the greatest man who ever lived,' it is not at all inconceivable that the Pharisees might have been treated unfairly even by our Lord Himself. His own opinion, indeed, is that Jesus 'having in effect broken with the religion of Torah, and being in the position of a man driven to bay, fighting, as the saying is, with His back against the wall, it is only human nature that He should so speak as to hit hard.' The conclusion he comes to, accordingly, is that the Pharisees on the whole are misrepresented in the New Testament, that they were better men, and practised a better religion, than the New Testament leads us to believe.

The Gospel of Hosea.

By Rev. James Strahan, M.A., Edinburgh.

'**For I am God, and not man.**'—Hos. xi. 9.

Hosea was one of the most beautiful souls that has ever lived and suffered in our earth. The most ethereal of the prophets, he seems like a spirit from a better world, radiating a pure heavenly light amid the dark shadows of time. In the whole gallery of Old Testament portraits there is no more fascinating figure than that of the prophet of Divine and human love. If he had not been an inspired teacher, he might have been a great lyric

poet. One of the first, he was also one of the noblest of the not very large family of the mystics, who dare to make their own thoughts, feelings, and actions the norm of divinity. Mysticism has been defined by Vaughan, in his somewhat unsympathetic *Hours with the Mystics*, as 'that form of error which mistakes for a Divine manifestation the operations of a merely human faculty.' This hard saying surely applies only to the lower, and fails to take account of the higher, forms of mysticism. It can scarcely be doubted that certain human minds have had a wonderful affinity with the Divine mind. The light that has been in them has not been darkness, and if we are to understand such mysticism as theirs, we must rather begin by doing justice to that fine Hebrew saying, 'The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord.' With Plato and Plotinus, the Hebrew and the Christian mystic take the things of time and sense for mirrors or symbols of eternal heavenly realities, and they can no more doubt their intuitions of God than they can doubt their own existence. It is true that even the purest human mind has never—except once—been an absolutely perfect medium for the transmission of the white radiance of eternity; and few confessions are more pathetic than that of Savonarola, the prophet-mystic of Florence, 'I count as nothing: darkness encompasses me: *yet the light I saw was the light from heaven.*' No doubt it was; and this inward illumination is the distinction of the true mystic. The very keenness of the self-scrutiny and self-blame of these great and humble souls makes us the readier to admit the essential validity of their unfaltering claims to Divine insight, and we shall find how little the light of heaven was either distorted or discoloured as it passed through the mind of the prophet of Ephraim.

It is characteristic of the mystic that he does not need to stray from home in quest of the Divine secret. Hosea received his message neither in the solitude of the desert, nor in the society of other prophets. Rather the truth met him at his own threshold, revealed herself to him there, and summoned him thence to his life-work. Other prophets might come down from the mountains or up from the wilderness to thunder the word of the Lord in the ear of the nation, but there is no indication that Hosea ever wandered, or wished to wander, from the valleys and meadows, the orchards and vineyards, of his much-loved Ephraim. There never was a truer patriot. The concentration of his thoughts is evidenced by the fact that while Ephraim is always on his lips—it occurs thirty-six times in his prophecy—he never once names Jerusalem, and all the references to Judah seem to be interpolations made by the Judean hands through which his work has passed. Too individual and original to owe much to other minds, he never affected the manners or felt the contagious influence of 'the sons of the prophets,' probably never wore the picturesque prophetic mantle of dark haircloth, and never had any connexion with the guilds of prophets who led a cœnobitic life and fanned each other's religious enthusiasm with the breath of music and song. Nor was he conscious of any temperamental affinity with the fanatical Nazirites and Rechabites—true descendants of the desert Bedouin—who had a quarrel with civilization as such, for how could he doubt that 'the corn, wine and oil, the silver and gold' were gifts of God? He was rather a man of the people, attempting, in an age of material splendour and spiritual decay, to live a common life well. Sensitive, poetic, imaginative, pensive, with far more than an ordinary capacity alike for joy and sorrow, he was intensely alive to the quiet beauty of nature, the peacefulness of home, the sanctities and fidelities of love. With such a common life he would have been well content. But God had other thoughts regarding him, and higher work for him to do, calling him to be one of the greatest religious teachers the world has ever seen.

True mystic that he was, Hosea recognized that his gospel was inseparable from his personality. Had he not felt that some indication of the development of his mind was an essential part of his message, he would never have written his poignant prelude. He perceived that the doctrine could not be understood without the personal illustration; the Divine archetype was only to be seen through the human type. There is an apparent egoism in the mystic which is compatible with a very real and profound humility. Indeed, his task of speaking of himself is sometimes the heaviest of crosses. Hosea would never have given his *confessio amantis* to a cold and critical world if he had not felt himself in the grip of an overmastering necessity. Wild horses would never have dragged the tale from him, but the hand of the Lord was upon him, and he could not choose but speak.

With touching reserve, in a quiet historical style which is yet tremulous with feeling and infinitely more moving than floods of impassioned rhetoric, he tells the story of his heart, not because he wishes to attract any attention to himself, but because he has so much to say of the Sacred Heart which beats at the centre of all things. Through an outer portal he will lead us into the temple's inner shrine. He has found that the Divine and the human secret of existence are one; they have both revealed themselves to him at the flaming core of an ordinary life.

The transfiguration of the common human lot, which henceforth shines with a radiance from heaven, is ever the most thrilling and wonderful of experiences. Suggestions of this more than magical change may be noted in external nature. 'The House Beautiful' is only 'a naked house' on 'a naked moor':

> Yet shall your ragged moor receive
> The incomparable pomp of eve.

It is the task of the artist to open our eyes to the glory of 'things we have passed a hundred times nor cared to see,' till it begins to dawn upon us that 'every common bush' is 'afire with God.' But it is from the hidden depths of the human soul, touched by a light from heaven, that life itself catches a splendour which never again fades away.

There were two days of Hosea's life in which the gates of reality finally opened to him. The one was the day in which he declared his love, the other the day in which he was disillusioned. It was the second of these days—when his Eden was withered, and naught remained but 'bare ruined quires where late the sweet birds sang'; when his temple was in ruins, the shrine empty, the holy of holies desecrated—that really tested him. The ordeal to such a nature as his was the severest imaginable, the pain too exquisite for words, the sense of wrong too deep for tears. From his seven times heated furnace, how did he emerge? How did he take up the task of life again? Did he merely laugh a bitter laugh and turn to seek other pleasures? Did he live to write a dreary little 'Vanitas Vanitatum.' Did he anticipate the cynic of his race who set his seal to the insulting dictum, 'One type of manhood among a thousand have I found, but an ideal of womanhood among all these have I not found'?

If that had been the end of it, we should never have heard of him and his story. He would have had no gospel for Israel and mankind. But when the first anguish of disillusionment was past, he came out of the depths not merely with the peace of an accepted sorrow, but with the awakened consciousness that love is love for ever. 'Love is not love which alters when it alteration finds. . . . It hath the quality of everlastingness.' One cannot but wonder if the prophet knew those words, first heard somewhere among the hills and vales of Ephraim, and more fervent than any ever breathed by the burning lips of Sappho:

> For love is strong as death. . . .
> The flashes thereof are flashes of fire,
> A very flame of the Lord.
> Many waters cannot quench love
> Neither can the floods drown it.

At any rate the truth that love is unquenchable was the keynote of the prophet's whole after life. Love was evermore his Lord and king, who could not be defeated or discrowned. Therefore we find him ordering all the rest of his days on the calm assumption that love must triumph. We see him always in the attitude of intensely eager, but perfectly assured, waiting. We watch his love bearing all things, believing all things, hoping all things, enduring all things, and never failing. It is patient because eternal. Just when it appears to have received its death-blow, it proves itself to be deathless, a truth which is the burden of perhaps the finest sonnet in the English language:

> Now at the last gasp of Love's latest breath,
> When, his pulse failing, Passion speechless lies,
> When Faith is kneeling at his bed of death
> And Innocence is closing up his eyes,
> Now if thou would'st, when all have given him over,
> From death to life thou might'st him yet recover.

Now, as is the man, such is his gospel. There never was a clearer illustration of the principle that the heart makes the theologian. With the uttermost daring of a simple faith, Hosea makes his own mind an index of the Mind of Deity. It is true, he might have done the same if he had been hard and unforgiving; he might have done the same if he had set his face like a flint, and determined simply to be just; he might have done the same if thoughts of repudiation and reprobation had barred out all other thoughts. But in that case he would have had no gospel, he would simply have been one more stern censor of sin and preacher of righteous-

ness. It was his conduct in the supreme moral crisis of his life that made his mind like a sensitized plate ready to receive a new image of God. His own forgiving pity, his own redeeming love, won for him a sudden vision of the great Heart of the Eternal. From that hour he knew that inextinguishable in the bosom of God burns the original uncreated flame of love, of which all other love is the emanation and reflexion. And he knew that the norm of divinity is not man's all too prevalent inhumanity to his fellow-man, but man's nobility in those rare moments when he rises completely above himself into the atmosphere of another and a better world. The revelation probably astonished no one more than the prophet himself. Immediately he began to wonder if he had ever till then really known God at all. How blind and dull and stupid he had been! He had never realized what heights and depths of patient goodness there are in the Divine nature. He had never *sympathized* with Israel's God, whose holy love had been so long and so cruelly requited with ingratitude and infidelity. The new revelation, bursting upon his mind and opening his lips, made him a prophet. His gospel clothed itself in great words, which were not the fruit of the toiling intellect, but the gift of eternal love. And as for his own private sorrow, it was all but completely swallowed up in the joy of the apocalypse of Divine grace; so much so, that with another act of incredible daring, another intuition of childlike faith, he declares that even *that* marriage was, after all, made in heaven (Hos 1^2).

Thus for the first time in history it dawned upon the human mind that God's sovereign attribute in heaven and in earth is His loving-kindness. The words almost tremble on the prophet's lips, though it was reserved for an apostle to utter them, that 'God is love.' Later seers and poets would express the truth in many other noble and beautiful forms, but there is a mingling of burning passion and melting pathos in Hosea's primitive Hebrew gospel —his protevangelium—which makes it for ever memorable:

> How shall I give thee up, Ephraim?
> How shall I deliver thee, Israel?
> How shall I make thee as Admah?
> How shall I set thee as Zeboim?
> My heart is turned within me,
> All my sympathies are all aglow.
> I will not execute the fierceness of my anger,
> I will not turn to destroy Ephraim:
> For I am God, and not man.

For the first time it is seen that the real and fundamental difference between God and man is not His almightiness appalling our impotence, His greatness dwarfing our littleness, His omniscience amazing our ignorance, but His love shaming our loveless-ness. That is the quintessence of Deity. By loving and redeeming where it was natural, as all the world thought, to loathe and reject, Hosea instinctively separated himself from men, took sides with God, and suddenly found himself caught up to a height from which he could see, as man had never seen before, that

> Broad and deep and glorious,
> Like the heavens above,
> Shines in might victorious,
> God's eternal love.

At the same time, Hosea's experience enabled him to realize, like no one before him, the moral dilemma in the counsels of God, the acuteness of the conflict between the claims of justice and pity. To a mind like his, law without love, and love without law, were conceptions equally intolerable. And if, like our own great religious poet, he had sought refuge in the conclusion that 'all's love and all's law,' yet that would only have been a partial solution. The mind cannot rest except in a unity. There must be sovereignty and subordination in the attributes of God; and when Hosea's view of the universe, after many oscillations, at last adjusts itself, the crown is on the head of Love, before which Law bows as the most awful but most obedient of ministers.

There is a prevalent notion that men like Hosea, the Old Testament prophet of love, and John, the New Testament apostle of love, are soft emotionalists, with no iron in their blood, no rigour in their gospel. There could be no greater mistake. Hosea's passion for righteousness is even more vehement than that of Amos. As the spiritual physician of Israel, faithfully diagnosing her moral and social diseases, he does not hesitate to announce that desperate remedies are needed. He is not one to shrink from the use of the knife, or blanch at the sight of blood. It is no sentimentalist who utters the terrific words:

> Shall I deliver them from the power of Sheol?
> Shall I redeem them from death?
> Hither with thy plagues, O death!
> Hither with thy pestilence, O Sheol!
> Repentance is hid from mine eyes.

But his last word can never be judgment or

death or destruction. He knows that God smites in order to save, cuts deep in order to heal (6^1). His distinctive and dominant conception—his inevitable word—is 'love' (*hesed*), which sums up both his religion and his ethics. 'I drew them with human cords, with bands of love' (11^4). 'It is love that I delight in, and not sacrifice' (6^6).

For how many thousands, or millions, of years had the living God been waiting for some mind to mirror and reveal His true nature to man! How patiently He had carried on 'the education of the human race,' always with this end in view, and always realizing that a lesson is never taught until it is learned! Hosea, with a heart purified and a mind illuminated by suffering, is the first to penetrate God's open secret, that the deepest essence of Being is an inalienable love which cannot rest until it has redeemed the captive and saved the lost. Henceforth the Dweller in the Innermost, though unseen, will not be unknown.

It is not easy, therefore, to calculate our debt to Hosea. 'When we consider,' says Professor Cornill, 'that all this was absolutely new, that those thoughts in which humanity has been educated and which have consoled it for 3000 years, were all first spoken by Hosea, we must reckon him among the greatest religious geniuses which the world has ever produced. . . . That this man, so apparently a man of emotion, governed entirely by his moods, and driven helplessly hither and thither by them, should have possessed a formal theological system, which has exercised an immeasurable influence on future generations, is a phenomenon of no slight significance. . . . But it is not too much to say that the entire faith and theology of later Israel grew out of Hosea, that all its characteristic views and ideas are to be first found in his book.'

Rapt into intense communion with God, till his eyes are opened to catch glimpses of eternal realities, and his ears to hear a music sweeter than that of the spheres, the prophet reports his experience. And this is what the Revealer says in human speech: 'I will not forsake, I will not destroy, I will love and redeem: for I am God, and not man.' In the antithesis between God's warm love and man's cold indifference, therefore, lies all our hope of salvation. Another prophet heard a continuation of the strain: 'For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts' (Is $55^{8.9}$).

The Psalmist caught the rapture of it:

> For as the heaven in its height
> The earth surmounteth far,
> So great to those who do him fear
> His tender mercies are.

And finally the Christian poet gives the truth a perfect expression:

> For the love of God is broader
> Than the measures of man's mind,
> And the heart of the Eternal
> Is most wonderfully kind.

Before the coming of Christ the world saw no more Christlike spirit than Hosea, and our Lord linked His own eternal gospel to that of the prophet of Ephraim by His favourite thrice-repeated quotation, 'I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.' All the grace that Hosea found in Israel's God, that, and something more, we find in the 'strong Son of God, immortal Love.' The incarnation resolved the antithesis between the attributes and the actions of God and man. 'I will not destroy: for I am God, and not man'—that was the gospel to Israel. 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends'—that is the gospel given to all mankind by Him who 'seemeth human and divine, the highest, holiest manhood'; who is not come to destroy, but to save, for He is God *and* man, in one person, for ever.

Contributions and Comments.

Note on Variant in the Text of John i. 13.

ALTHOUGH the MSS. authority supports the Textus receptus in reading οἳ . . . ἐγεννήθησαν, there are strong reasons for preferring ὃς . . . ἐγεννήθη. The latter was the text as known to Irenæus and Tertullian, and used by them against heretics as the undoubted original. There are unmistakable echoes of it, indeed, in Justin (see 'Ante-Nicene Library,' to which the subsequent references are made), *First Apology*, chaps. 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, pp. 25, 27, 35; and *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. 63, p. 173. Irenæus quotes it three times. (1) In his treatise *Against Heresies* (Bk. iii. 16. 2, vol. i. p. 325) he writes: 'But the birth of Christ was on this wise,' and (Mt 1^{18}) '. . . Matthew might certainly have said, "Now the birth of *Jesus* was on this wise"; but the Holy Ghost, foreseeing the corrupters [of the truth], and guarding by anticipation against their deceit, says by Matthew, "But the birth of *Christ* was on this wise"; and that He is Emmanuel, lest perchance we might consider Him as a mere man: for "not by the will of the flesh, nor by the will of man, but by the will of God was the Word made flesh."' (2) In the same book (chap. 19. 2, p. 345), 'But he to whom the Father which is in heaven has revealed Him, knows Him, so that he understands that He "who was not born either by the will of the flesh, or by the will of man," is the Son of Man, This is the Christ, the Son of the living God.' (3) In Bk. v. chap. 1. 3, he writes (ii. p. 58), 'In the last times, not by the will of the flesh, nor by the will of man, but by the good pleasure of the Father, His hands formed a living man, etc.' In no one of these three quotations can Irenæus be taken as 'adapting' the words of Jn 1^{13}. He uses the words as decisively proving that the Lord who became flesh was not 'a mere man,' 'But that He had, beyond all others, in Himself that pre-eminent birth which is from the Most High Father, and also experienced that pre-eminent generation which is from the Virgin, the divine Scriptures do in both respects testify of Him' (i. p. 345). His critical remarks on the text of Mt 1^{18} show he was careful of the exact text handed down; and indeed he is nothing if not conservative of 'tradition' through all his writings. It cannot be said that his quotations have been taken from a Latin Version by his translator, for his argument demands the singular ὅς, as spoken of the Incarnate Word; and not the οἵ, describing the regeneration of those who receive Him.

Tertullian is, if possible, even a more explicit witness to the ὃς . . . ἐγεννήθη. In his treatise 'On the flesh of Christ,' chap. 19 (vol. ii. p. 203), he writes: 'What then is the meaning of this passage, "Born (natus) not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God"? I will make more use of this passage after I have confuted those who have tampered with it. They maintain that it was written thus [in the plural] "*who were born*, etc.," as if designating those who were before mentioned as "believing in His name," in order to point out the existence of that mysterious seed of the elect and spiritual which they appropriate to themselves. But how can this be, when all who believe in the name of the Lord are, by reason of the common principle of the human race, born of blood, and of the will of the flesh, and of man, as indeed is Valentinus himself. The expression is in the singular number, as referring to the Lord, "He was born of God."' On this Tertullian founds his argument (see also chaps. 15, 16, 18, 24, pp. 196, 199, 201, 213). Tertullian, though not ignorant of Greek, uses a Latin text. He was acquainted with a very early Latin version, which already 'in his time had become obsolete.' 'In usum exiit.' (Godet on John, Eng. trans., vol. i. p. 198 *note*.) Had this ancient version not agreed with the *Itala*, Tertullian could hardly have so boldly accused the heretics of corrupting the text. There is thus clear evidence for a very early text which had ὃς . . . ἐγεννήθη; a reading which must have been known to Irenæus in the Greek when a disciple of Polycarp in Smyrna, else he could not have used it as he did; and which, if accepted and handed on by Polycarp, is well attested. It is in the last degree improbable that Polycarp could have passed on to his disciple an inaccurate reading of his Master John on so momentous a passage of his Gospel;[1] or that Irenæus would have set

[1] A friend has drawn my attention to the following from Abbott and from Blass:—

'Irenæus and Tertullian must have read ἐγεννήθη (natus est) for ἐγεννήθησαν; for both of them take the passage as

aside that which he learned of Polycarp for a Latin translation.

It is not necessary to suppose that the alteration was deliberately made, as Tertullian says. The emphatic ὅσοι, with which the sentence begins, might very naturally suggest to a copyist that the ὅς should be οἵ . . ., and the verb be made plural also. This is far more likely than Westcott's suggestion that the singular was introduced in the Latin translation to agree with the preceding αὐτοῦ. Admittedly, the masculine οἵ creates a difficulty (Meyer and Godet, *in loco*). It has to be connected with the neuter τέκνα. But a more serious difficulty is met in the past tense, and the interpretation of the verse in accordance with it. How could it be said that to those who received Him—*i.e.* who believe on His name, was given 'right *to become* the children of God,' if they had been before 'born of God'? But the most serious objection to the received text has yet to be noted —that the use of the aorist οἳ . . . ἐγεννήθησαν, as applied to the regenerate, is contrary to the careful usage of St. John. He habitually uses the perfect tense in speaking of those *who have been* born of God, and *are*, therefore, His children; and as scrupulously uses the aorist in speaking of the eternally-begotten. In 1 Jn 5^{18} he writes: Οἴδαμεν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει, ἀλλ' ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τηρεῖ ἀυτόν (cf. 3^9 4^8 5^1). Here ὁ γεννηθείς stand as a distinctive name. The aorist is used in Jn $3^{3.5.7}$ because our Lord is asserting that the definite experience of a birth from above must have taken place before one can see or enter the Kingdom of God; but in vv.$^{6.8}$ John, as usual, writes in the perfect tense of those who having been born of the Spirit have the divine life.

One would certainly expect the perfect tense in Jn 1^{13} if the regenerate were meant. But there is no variant in the MSS. as to the tense, and the difficulty of the plural aorist cannot be explained away. It vanishes when we read the singular: 'As many as received him, to them he gave right to become children of God, even to them believing on the name of him who was born of God.' This construction accords with St. John's usage, cf. chaps. 3^{18} 20^{31}, 1 Jn 3^{23}. In A.V. and R.V. one feels a lack of definition of 'the name,' as the effective source of regeneration to them that believe in it, which is at once supplied when it is read as 'The name of him who is the Begotten of God.' It is relevant, as a digression regarding the regenerate would not be; and is in perfect accord with Johannine and Pauline doctrine: That we become children of God by believing on the Name of His Son. But what could be more irrelevant than to turn aside to say of a *spiritual* birth that it was not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of a man—'man' being here used as synonymous with 'husband'? Those are not the terms which would be naturally used in speaking about a spiritual birth: it would have been enough to say it was 'of God.' The parenthesis becomes also at once intelligible. The explanations of its clauses, 'who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man,' as applied to the regenerate, are about as many as the commentators upon them: and often quite contradictory and obscure. As written of the Incarnate Son of God each is plain: 'He was not born of any of the races of mankind, nor by ordinary generation, nor had He an earthly father.' The latter clause is equivalent to Lk 1^{34}, and, as Tertullian says, cannot be true of any ordinary man. It is significant that the words οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός were, by the writer of Codex B, assigned to the margin, possibly because he felt the force of Tertullian's very obvious criticism. There can be no doubt that the reading ὅς was well known and widely accepted in the second century; that the singular aorist is in accordance with the usage of St. John, while the plural is not, as he always uses that tense of the only begotten, never of the regenerate—a usage perpetuated in the γεννηθέντα of the Nicene Creed; and that the cumulative value of the

describing the birth of Christ, and Tertullian accuses the Valentinians of altering the text so as to apply it to the above-mentioned "Credentes" instead of Christ' (Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, p. 214, paragraph 2269*a*).

Blass, in his *Philology of the Gospels*, says: 'Among individual passages of contested readings there is none more deserving our attention than the thirteenth verse of the first chapter' [of John], and he gives his reasons for accepting the singular ἐγεννήθη, as supported by external and internal evidence, pp. 234–237. He would delete the pronoun ὅς; but the parallel of 1 Jn 5^{18} supports it.

The following also may be quoted from Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 278: '*Actus Petri c. Simone*, c. 24, ed. Lipsius, p. 72: Alter propheta dicit, "Non de vulva mulieris natus, sed de coelesti loco descendit." Lipsius bemerkt hiezu: "Unde verba *non de vulva . . . descendit* sumta sint, nescio." Doch vgl. Joh. i. 13.' These last words appear to imply that Resch accepts the reading ὃς ἐγεννήθη.

three clauses in the parenthesis becomes at once manifest when understood as written of Him whom no one of all the races of man can claim, who was not born by ordinary generation, and to whom no man was father; but in whom all, who by faith receive Him as the only begotten (ver. 18), find themselves to be the children of God.

There is ground enough, surely, to recognize this very early text as entitled at least to a place in the margin of any new 'Revised Version.'

Crieff. ARCH. HENDERSON.

'Sirs, ye are Brethren.'

Is this the correct translation of Ac 7^{26}? I know of no writer who has thought of changing it. And yet, it seems, we must remove the comma after *ἄνδρες* and translate 'Ye are brethren,' literally 'Men brethren are ye.' Compare the constant use of *ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί* in Acts from 1^{16} 2^{29} onward; especially in our passage the reading of Codex D: *τί ποιεῖτε, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί; ἵνα τί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους*; but, above all, the parallel passage from the Old Testament, which appears to be at the background of our passage, Gn 13^{8}, אנשים אחים אנחנו, *ἄνθρωποι ἀδελφοὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν*, we are brethren, literally 'men brethren.' Even H. J. White, in the new *editio minor* of the Latin N.T., prints *Viri, fratres estis*, where the larger edition had given *Viri fratres* without comma, 'Ye are brotherly men.'

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Joseph Woodhouse, Lindfield, New South Wales.

Illustrations of the Great Text for September must be received by the 1st of August. The text is 1 Co 4^{5}.

The Great Text for October is 1 Co 15^{58}—'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts' or of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for November is Ro 15^{13}—'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.' A copy of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or of Lewis's *Philocalia of Origen*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for December is Jn 6^{35}—'Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' A copy of Welch's *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*, or of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Gem's *An Anglo-Saxon Abbot*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for January is 2 Ch 6^{8}—'But the Lord said unto David my father, Whereas it was in thine heart to build an house for my name, thou didst well that it was in thine heart.' A copy of Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Themis is the title of a new book which has been written by Jane Ellen Harrison, Hon. LL.D. (Aberdeen), Hon. D.Litt. (Durham). It is published in Cambridge at the University Press (15s. net). 'Themis' is the subject of the last chapter of the book. And inasmuch as that chapter is the summary, as well as the summit, of the book's whole argument, there is some appropriateness in the choice of 'Themis' for the title.

But who or what is Themis? Whether 'who' is correct, or 'what,' depends on the stage in the evolution of the religion of Greece upon which you enter. If you take Greek religion at the Homeric stage, the form of the question would be 'Who is Themis?' 'What is Themis?' would be the correct form if you enter it near the beginning of that previous and long-lasting period which Miss Harrison investigates in her new book.

In Homer Themis is a goddess, and dwells in Olympos. She has two functions. She convenes and dissolves the assembly of the gods, and she presides over the feast. Zeus bade Themis 'call the gods to council from many-folded Olympos' brow.' Whereupon she 'ranged all about and bade them to the house of Zeus.' Why did Zeus, the supreme god, not summon the assembly himself? Because he was not supreme. Themis was before Zeus in being, and before him in honour. Even Homer cannot hide the fact. And so, when the assembly is gathered together, Themis takes the chair. She presides over the banquet, and dismisses the gods when the banquet is over.

For Themis is Doom. The words are etymologically one. We were taught at school to translate the word Themis by 'Right.' And the translation was not altogether out of it. But 'Doom' is better. For Doom is the thing that is fixed or settled. It begins with opinion. There is your opinion and there is mine. When many opinions agree the matter is settled. It has become Doom. Laid out in language, you may call it Law. But it does not need to be laid out as Law. As binding, as awful as any Law is that collective opinion called most inadequately Custom. It is Doom. The day it dawns upon us as an inescapable force is our Doomsday. And when we project it into the future, conceiving of it as awaiting us in that dim and dreaded after-life, we call it the Crack of Doom, the Last Judgment.

Now this is not the way in which *we* came to the conception of the Last Judgment. For us it was not custom or convention projected into the future. First we came to the knowledge of God, and the Last Judgment was to us 'the Day of the Lord.' For from the beginning we have had in

our hands a Bible, and that Bible has given us God. But the Greeks, having no Bible, had no God given to them. They came to the conception of a God at last. And this was the very way they came to it. One man's opinion agreeing with another man's, there gradually arose a sense of some things settled. That sense became Custom. In process of time Custom became venerable, awful; its origin was lost in the past, its grasp was laid on the future. It became the highest and most adorable. It was called God. And even after there were Gods many in the land of Greece, Custom—Right, Doom, Themis—still held the highest place, called the gods together, presided over them, and dismissed their assembly.

Was this the religion of the Greeks, then? Yes; this was their religion, and that was the way they attained to it. It was not the only way in which men attained to religion. There were others who had no Themis, no sense of the majesty of Doom, who were nevertheless religious.

There were the Cyclopes, for example. The Cyclopes were religious, undoubtedly. They were conspicuous by their piety. For they trusted wholly in God for food and raiment and did not till the ground.

A people proud to whom no law is known,
And, trusting to the deathless Gods alone,
They plant not and they plough not, but the earth
Bears all they need, unfurrowed and unsown:
Barley and wheat, and vines whose mighty juice
Swells the rich clusters when the rain of Zeus
Gives increase; and among that race are kept
No common councils, nor are laws in use.

The Greeks could not deny the religion of the Cyclopes. They could not ignore it. They were greatly distressed when they considered it. For the Cyclopes had no Themis. And this was the more incomprehensible and distressing to the Greeks when they remembered that the Cyclopes were by no means individualists. They had a family life and even excelled in it. But they went no further. They had no public life. They did not meet in assemblies. They had no market-place. That to the Greek was the last desolation. We hear the chorus in remote barbarian Tauri cry:

O for a kind Greek market-place again!

The Cyclopes had their family life. But in each family the father was supreme and the father's word was law.

For on the high peaks and the hillsides bare
In hollow caves they live, and each one there
To his own wife and children deals the law,
Neither has one of other any care.

The Cyclopes had no Themis. They had reached their Gods in another way from the Greeks. They had not carried custom through the family, the tribe, and the nation up to God. They had found their God in the kindly earth, in the sun and rain and fruitful seasons, and had been content. And undoubtedly it was a lower religion than the religion of the Greeks. The Greek religion was indistinguishable from morality perhaps; but it was at least the morality of a nation; the individual gave himself willingly for the nation's good. The religion of the Cyclopes was scarcely even morality. They did not care whether there was righteousness in the earth or not if there was plenty of barley and if rich clusters hung upon their vines. Their religion consisted in letting God find them barley and wheat and wine, and thanking him when He did. There is nothing lower than that to which the name of religion can be given.

The religion of the Greeks, we say, was higher. And yet it was properly not religion but morality. It is true there were Gods in it. And there was Doom, higher than the highest God, herself a God requiring worship. But Gods do not make religion. And the placing of Themis high among

the Gods only shows the more manifestly that along that road by which the Greeks went to find religion and God, neither God nor religion is to be found.

'And when he was alone, they that were about him with the twelve asked of him the parables. And he said unto them, Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them' (Mk 4^{10-12}).

Did Jesus really say this? Professor George JACKSON cannot believe it. Now Professor JACKSON is a Wesleyan. He has just been elected to the position of Resident Tutor at Didsbury College, Manchester. He was previously chosen to deliver the forty-second Fernley Lecture. And it is in that Lecture that he says he cannot believe that Jesus ever uttered this hard saying about the parables.

Why can he not believe it? The text is unassailable. The meaning is unmistakable. He cannot believe it simply because of the hardness of the saying itself. 'The words create a difficulty concerning the purpose of the parables which but for them would not have existed; for they seem to say that Christ adopted the parabolic method in order to hide the truths of the Kingdom from unspiritual minds; and such a purpose would be entirely at variance with the whole spirit of His ministry.'

Is Professor JACKSON entitled to reject a passage of the Gospels simply because he thinks that it is not after the mind of Christ? He believes that that is within his right. Nor do his fellow-believers dispute his right. And that being so, it is evident that no change has taken place within the last generation that can for a moment be compared in far-reaching issue with the change in the attitude of the Christian Church to the Bible.

It is in keeping with that change that Professor JACKSON, discussing in a single paragraph the authority of the Bible, declares with the same plainness of speech that in the old sense, the sense which we still attach to the word authority, the Bible has now no authority whatever. 'We no longer believe that a biblical statement is necessarily true simply because it is a biblical statement.' He refers to the historical and scientific facts which enter into the Bible narrative. Over these, he says, there is no room for authority; 'the only authority is the authority of the facts themselves.' But the situation is precisely the same in the realm of the moral and spiritual. Here also, he says, the authority is not of the Bible. The only authority that can be recognized by us is the authority of the truth which the Bible brings to us.

Mr. T. R. GLOVER, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and University Lecturer in Ancient History, has delivered a Lecture—the Swarthmore Lecture it is called—on *The Nature and Purpose of a Christian Society* (Headley Brothers; 1s. net). The tone of the lecture, perhaps the very title of it, suggests the thought that possibly Mr. GLOVER delivered it to an audience that was more interested in the individual than in society. And if we read the preface last, as we are always expected to do, we shall find that our surmise is right. The Swarthmore Lecture is a Quaker foundation. Mr. GLOVER's audience therefore consisted mainly of those to whom the great fact of life is the Inner Light, the revelation of God directly and immediately to their own individual souls.

Why did Mr. GLOVER lecture to Quakers on a Christian Society? For two reasons. First, because he believes that those who make much of the Inner Light have always to be warned against the abuse of that enjoyment. He quotes St.

John of the Cross. 'I am terrified,' says that Spanish mystic of the Counter Reformation, 'I am terrified by what passes among us in these days. Anyone who has barely begun to meditate, if he becomes conscious of these words during his self-recollection, pronounces them forthwith to be the work of God, and, considering them to be so, says, "God has spoken to me," or, "I have had an answer from God." But it is not true; such an one has only been speaking to himself. Besides, the affection and desire for these words which men encourage, cause them to reply to themselves, and then to imagine that God has spoken.'

The other reason is, that however sure of the Inner Light a man may be, and however accurately he may interpret it, he will be the better to hear what other men's experience has been. 'I believe,' says Mr. GLOVER, 'that any real light that comes to a man from God, directly or indirectly, will be confirmed by the light that comes to others from Him.' More than that, he believes that the experience of any individual is true only if it corresponds with the experience of the historic Church. 'I believe in George Fox as a religious teacher and not in Joseph Smith, Jun., because I am convinced that history is rational and relevant to ourselves. In every sphere of life progress has been made by use of past experience —in ship-building from the earliest dug-out to the *Olympic* and the *Mauretania*. In religion also the past is never irrelevant; it is a guiding series of lights, and it has to be prolonged.'

Now as Mr. GLOVER proceeds to make known the advantage to the individual Christian of a Christian Society, he comes inevitably to the doctrines that are held. For it is the doctrines that a man holds that make him differ from other men. No doubt, as St. James expresses it, if a man is to *show* that he has faith, he can do it only by his works. But it is his faith that makes him the man he is. It would seem, therefore, that doctrine is the great individualizer. It is so. Yet Mr. GLOVER believes, and believes with all his might, that no doctrine of vital worth can be held securely by any man unless he finds that it is held also by other men.

For the vital doctrines of Christianity are very difficult. They are difficult to comprehend. They are most difficult to make the venture of life on. What is the history of the Church but the history of conflict about doctrine? One individual, seeking to express the relation of the Son to the Father, says *homoiousios*, of similar substance; another *homoousios*, of the same substance. Other individuals range themselves on either side; and the modern Carlyle laughs sardonically at the spectacle of a Church rent in twain over a diphthong. But at last the Christian Society determines that 'the same in substance' is the only Catholic doctrine. And even a Carlyle lives to see that the continued existence of the Church depended on that diphthong.

Very well, let the individual find his doctrine of the person of Christ. Is it possible for him to find it and be fully persuaded of it without once referring it to the history of Christian doctrine? Mr. GLOVER says that there are three great difficult doctrines which have kept the Christian society alive, and which in return the Christian society has kept for the individual. He does not think it possible that any Christian man or woman can be fully persuaded of any of these doctrines, so difficult are they, if no reference is made to the experience of the Church.

The first is the doctrine of Grace. Mr. GLOVER seems to say that the doctrine of Grace is peculiarly a doctrine of the individual. He quotes the remark lately made, that men as a rule do not care much about the doctrine of Grace till they reach the age of thirty, and he says that there is an element of truth in it. For it is not till we get a just measure of our own forces and deficiencies that we care to ask for Divine aid.

> When Duty whispers low, Thou must,
> The youth replies, I can.

But the man in middle age is less ready with that answer. 'O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me?' is more apt to be his thought. Christianity is, in short, 'the religion of all poor devils,' as the German Jew Börne said of it. And the man who appreciates the doctrine of Grace is the man who is conscious of failure, conscious too that he can no longer wrestle against failure, and is ready to accept whatever is offered him.

So for a moment it seems as if Grace were altogether a thing for the individual. But the doctrine of Grace is found to be a most difficult doctrine. To believe that all the past is forgiven, to believe that every new hour's needs bring ever new supply of Grace—to believe, that is to say, just when we are most despondent, that we are accepted in the Beloved and have grace given to help us in every time of need—that is difficult indeed. But the experience of those who have gone this way before is invariable and overwhelming.

'Difficulty round about and within'—these are Mr. GLOVER'S words,—'a deepening consciousness of weakness and inadequacy, and the experience that, with a daily surrender to God's will and a daily acceptance of His power flooding life with joy and peace and helpfulness, all things become possible—these are the foundations on which the Church's doctrine of Grace rests; and they have been well tested in the centuries.'

The second doctrine is the doctrine of the Incarnation. It is curious, is it not, that Mr. GLOVER should put the doctrine of Grace first, and the doctrine of the Incarnation second? But he is considering the individual, and assuredly in the experience of the individual grace is before incarnation. 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life'—that is God's order. But the believer's order is the belief first, the fact of the forgiveness, the joy of grace, and then the amazing discovery that it is the end of a great scheme of redemption laid out by the love of the Almighty.

Now who can believe the doctrine of the Incarnation without reference to the history of the Church? We sometimes hear it said that we should all be Unitarian if it were not for the Bible. Let us add 'and the Church.' For this is a great and difficult doctrine, and we need the testimony of 'all the saints who from their labours rest.'

What is their testimony? It is that they died for Christ. For what Christ did they die? Says Mr. GLOVER, 'There is something even ludicrous in the idea of a man dying for the crucified phantom of the Docetist. Who could die for a Jesus who devised a conjuring trick in order to avoid death Himself?'

For life is sweet, says Mr. GLOVER. And he remembers Borrow. 'There's night and day, brother, both sweet things; sun, moon, and stars, brother, all sweet things; there's likewise a wind on the heath. Life is very sweet, brother; who would wish to die?' Life is sweet to the Christian saint, as sweet as to the Spanish gypsy.

> Heaven above is softer blue,
> Earth around is sweeter green!
> Something lives in every hue
> Christless eyes have never seen:
> Birds with gladder songs o'erflow,
> Flowers with deeper beauties shine,
> Since I know, as *now* I know
> I am His, and He is mine.

And yet the Christian saints did not refuse to die. They did not, when the Church was at its quietest and best, put themselves in the way of martyrdom, but they did not put themselves out of the way of it. For they knew that He who died for them was no other than the only begotten Son of God. And thus, 'to men who in every fibre of their thinking are individualists—as so

many of us are apt to be — who will each start anew to think the world out, wavering and shifting as to truth and the criteria by which it may be judged —there is something awful, something wonderful, in the great spectacle of the Church in its solidarity standing one great witness to a faith which the individual, with his short range, working on preconceptions imposed on him by his day, would pronounce impossible and incredible. It is something to realize that in every age men have found it impossible and incredible, and have committed themselves to a faith that went beyond their understanding and been justified.'

The third doctrine is the doctrine of the Judgment. That the doctrine of the Judgment has held a place in the history of the Church, and has held it so prominently and so long, is one of the puzzles of this time. There is no doubt, be it ever so puzzling now, that our fathers believed in the Last Judgment. But how did they believe in it? Here is the marvel. The doctrine of the Judgment became to them a mighty force for righteousness. That a Judgment there would be, and that the Judge would be Christ their Saviour, gave them a standard of righteousness of the loftiest kind. So lofty was the standard that in every age it was found to be unapproachable. The reach, in Browning's phrase, ever exceeded the grasp. And yet its height has been justified by history. There are those who explain the progress of human morality by the use of the word Evolution. It is merely a word to juggle with. 'Historically,' says Mr. GLOVER, 'nothing has helped mankind forward so uniformly and so steadily as the concentration of the Church's thought on its Master and its Judge.'

'We believe that He will come to be our Judge.' The belief is our inheritance from the Christian Society. Let us repeat it to such good purpose that for each one of us this most difficult doctrine of the Last Judgment may be a power making for righteousness.

The Pilgrim's Progress.

By the Rev. John Kelman, D.D., Edinburgh.

The Second Part.

We have now reached the last section of the journey, from the Delectable Mountains to the end. The special feature of this portion is indeed that which more or less characterizes the whole of the Second Part of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the comfort and welcome that there are in Christianity for the weak. It is peculiarly interesting to notice the emphasis laid upon this by so robust a man as John Bunyan. The tenderness of such characters as his need not, however, surprise us. In the midst of his rough strength there is an extraordinary sensitiveness and an imaginative delicacy which may well prepare us for such compassion and understanding of those who are not strong like himself; and if at times the weak brother becomes troublesome, or even allows himself to trade upon his weakness, Bunyan will answer your remonstrance by a reminder that he himself and all his stronger readers have also much in them that needs toleration.

The Delectable Mountains.

Here we are met at the outset by the usual care of the weak. This is the place of spiritual vision and understanding, and here the strong must choose and find their spirituality for themselves, while the shepherds will need to give all their attention to the feeble. 'So the feeble and the weak went on, and Mr. Great-heart and the rest did follow.'

On the whole the passage is not quite so open-air and breezy as the corresponding passage in the

First Part, and the scenes are rather of the nature of tableaux than of landscape. Yet, on the other hand, the tone is more cheerful and the thoughts more exhilarating than those depressing visions of doom which formed the greater part of the story of the Delectable Mountains in the earlier part. There are in all four new scenes.

1. 'Mount Marvel, where they looked and beheld a man at a distance, that tumbled the hills about with words.' This was the son of Great-grace, and he was 'set there to teach pilgrims how to believe down, and so tumble out of their way, what difficulties they shall meet with, by faith.' This is another of those little glimpses, such as that which we have had of Great-grace himself, which show us the sort of men and types of character upon which the heart of Bunyan loved to dwell. It is in curious and almost violent contrast to that growing company of weaklings with whom we are journeying, and doubtless it was meant to be so. Here is a man who neither makes nor feels difficulties, and to whom nothing is impossible. So vivid is his faith, and so unquestioning and whole-hearted, that all difficulties vanish before its bright advent. This is your true Christian Scientist, who, taking Christ literally, believes that faith can remove mountains. Such men were D. L. Moody and Gordon of Khartoum; and if indeed the material and visible world did not miraculously go down before them on all occasions, yet they were able, by faith, to overleap and ignore such instances of failure, and through unquenchable confidence they did actually achieve many impossibilities. One would have thought that for Mr. Ready-to-halt and for Mr. Fearing such a vision might be almost too bracing; but Bunyan believes in strength, although he pities weakness, and insists upon the glory of the strong and competent spirit, thus giving his answer to any who might have felt that the weak brother was being spoilt.

2. Mount Innocence,—with Godly-man walking in white upon it. It is interesting to remember that we have already met Innocence in the person of the damsel at the house of the Interpreter. There, the lesson was that of the lowliness of Innocence; here, it is of its loftiness. The thought reminds us of Mrs. Browning's poem of the *Lessons from the Gorse*, which so beautifully expresses it:

> Mountain gorses, do ye teach us
> From that academic chair
> Canopied with azure air,
> That the wisest word man reaches
> Is the humblest he can speak?
> Ye, who live on mountain peak,
> Yet live low along the ground, beside the grasses meek!

Godly-man is in white, and Prejudice and Ill-will are throwing dirt at him, but the dirt falls off in a little time, and his white garments shine more brightly than ever. This, no doubt, is true in the end of all slander of the innocent; yet, unfortunately, the dirt does not always fall off in a little time, and if Prejudice and Ill-will know their business well enough, they can generally manage to dim the brightness of the character they assault. The dirt which they throw directly in the form of definite accusations may indeed fall off at once, but if they are experts they will do little of that. They will merely go about in a vague way saying what a pity it is that the man has such a dirty coat; and in spite of its glittering whiteness they will be believed, for generality is the soul of slander, as all clever slanderers know only too well.

3. Mount Charity.—Here Bunyan falls back upon the simplest and most conventional form and doctrine of charity. We have met with it already in the story of Mercy and Mr. Brisk, and in the riddle which Mr. Honest gave his host as a nut to crack in the House of Gaius. The undiminished roll of cloth adds nothing to these former instances, and the moral is of course as old as the world. Every reader must observe how entirely we are losing sight of the scenery here, and the high mountain land might be anywhere for aught that we can see of it.

4. In the Ethiopian we have not even a new mountain, but only a 'place' where Fool and one Want-wit are washing an Ethiopian and only succeeding in making him blacker. This is a natural counterpart to the lesson of Mount Innocent, and it is true within the same limitations. Unfortunately, log-rolling and Mutual Praise Associations can for a time, and sometimes for a long time, delude the public only too well; and there is a curious tendency to exercise this false charity upon every mention of a really bad character. The late Professor A. B. Davidson used to say that 'there are some critics who prefer Esau to Jacob, and Saul to David, and Judas Iscariot to the Apostle

John.' The case of Judas Iscariot is the extreme instance of such whitewashing. Perhaps the barbarous severity with which his name was treated by earlier writers, such as Dante, may have been a temptation to later ones, among whom may be named Ruskin and De Quincey; but the verdict of history does not easily accept the glosses with which kind-hearted literary men or perverse interpreters have tried to reverse the only historical estimate of the traitor which we possess. In general, we are here facing the great and constant question of our attitude to sin. R. L. Stevenson tells how he upheld the doctrine that there are thoroughly bad men in the world against the more kindly judgment of his friend Fleeming Jenkin, and how, when he had narrated the case of one thoroughly bad man, the Professor still said that it was a dangerous way of thinking.[1] No one can fail to admire the spirit of charity that breathes in such views, and yet there is another side to it. Black is black, and facts are the only safe things we have to deal with in this world. It is just as bad to call black white as it is to throw mud; and to persist in it, so as to ignore the presence and the reality and the danger of evil, is to do what Stevenson has spoken of as the work of a wrecker, deranging the beacons upon a dangerous coast.

When Bunyan is upon this line at any rate, he seems to feel it incumbent upon him to go a little further. The two fools would have pled mercy as their reason for attempting to whitewash the Ethiopian, so Mercy shall pronounce upon the case. She desires to be shown the door that opens upon the By-Way to Hell from these mountains. Hearkening at the open door she hears the cries of three distinct types of the damned. One has been lost because of the evil of the home life for which his father has been responsible. A second, like Francis Spira, has lost his soul to save his life; and a third represents those who through indulgence have come to that place. Mercy is terrified, turns pale and trembles, and comes away saying, 'Blessed be he and she that are delivered from this place.' It is all that puritan Mercy can say, and Bunyan leaves it at that.

[1] *Memoir of Fleeming Jenkin.*

The introduction of Mercy suggests one of the most curious incidents in the whole story. In the Shepherds' Palace she has seen a wonderful looking-glass, and she longs for it violently. They ask the shepherds to give it to her, and the request is granted. What this glass stands for is a question of some interest. It is a kind of combination of a natural looking-glass which reflects the person who looks upon it, and a magic mirror which shows the face of the Prince. Its magical powers are such that it will show the Prince in whatever way you want to see him, either with the Crown of Thorns and the marks of the Cross, or in the glory of Heaven. It is, of course, a subject which has been treated in literature and folk-lore from time immemorial, and it is one peculiarly tempting to the imaginative. Nathaniel Hawthorne uses it in his brilliant account of the *Glass of Fancy*. In this passage we may be sure that Bunyan is thinking especially of the Epistle of St. James; together, no doubt, with a half-remembered sense of many a magic song and story he had heard. If that be so, the glass is undoubtedly the Word of God, and it is extremely interesting to notice how, as Bunyan comes near the end of his work, he closes in upon the thought of the Word. Metaphor after metaphor is used to indicate it. It is the Sword in the hand of Valiant and the Crutches of Mr. Ready-to-halt, a map, a light struck suddenly, and here a magic mirror, which, if held in one way, will show a pilgrim the uttermost truth about himself, but held in another way will reveal Christ to him. To complete the story, the other women receive corresponding presents such as ear-rings, jewels and bracelets, but there is nothing to indicate any particular significance in these. Once again it is interesting to notice how entirely the allegory is at every point breaking down. The glass which Mercy carries away with her is not a little portable mirror, but a 'great glass that hangs up in the dining-room.' We are far beyond the region now where consistency matters at all. There is a gale upon the spirit of the dreamer as he approaches the glories of the Celestial City, and Mercy might have carried the dining-room itself away with her, had it suited John Bunyan's purpose.

The Minor Parables, the Metaphors and Similes of the Synoptic Gospels.

By the Rev. R. M. Lithgow, Lisbon.

Our studies in the synthesis of the parabolic teaching have but kept in view those fifteen parables which constitute the Matthean sequence, with the fifteen in Luke, which form a parallel with them. These compose, as it were, the planetary system in that bright galaxy of metaphoric illustrations which bejewels the gospel firmament. At the outset of our investigations it was noted, that the thirty we have dealt with are those generally treated of as our Lord's parables, in the leading modern works on this subject. Still every writer does not include them all in his exposition of the parables. Thus the Rich Fool is not dealt with by Dr. Bruce, while Dr. Dods takes no note of these four, the Growing Corn, the Midnight Borrower, the Farm Servant, and the Pounds.

On the other hand, Dr. Bruce in his Parabolic Teaching, expounds three or four parables, outside the thirty of which we have taken account. To each of three he devotes a whole chapter, the Children in the Marketplace, the Children of the Bridechamber, and the Unfaithful Upper Servant. As the two latter occur each in combination with further teaching, relating in like form to the same point, they may both be regarded as triple parables, and Dr. Bruce has so expounded them. The former has as its appendages, teachings illustrated by the symbols of the patch, and the new wine, while the appended teachings of the latter are associated with the figures of servants awaiting their Master's return, and a householder prepared against the thief. Christ's recommendation of the lowest Seats at feasts is also, by way of introductory parallel to that of the Publican and Pharisee, expounded as a parable in this work, while its author treats shortly as parable-germs, the Two Builders, the Watchful Porter, the Dutiful Physician, and the Rejected Cornerstone. In a list of the parables attached to a recently published Bible, we find there included, the figures of the lamp and its stand, the tower-building and warring king, and the sheep and goats, and thus discover how wide is the notion which some Bible students entertain, in regard to the parabolic form of divine utterance and teaching.

We can well appreciate the difficulties of expositors in deciding as to what are and what are not parables, meaning by that parables of the first rank. The word parable is applied in the Gospels to other teachings of our Lord besides those which we are accustomed to designate in this way. The use by the Jews of the same word as an equivalent alike for proverb and parable, doubtless serves to explain this, and there are clear cases in which the so-called parable is really a proverb. Still there are also cases where this is not quite apparent, and this fact would seem to account for the appearance of some of the extra parables dealt with by Dr. Bruce, three of which are thus denominated in Luke's Gospel.

There are in all seven cases, apart from the recognized parables, where, in the Gospels, we find the word 'parable' applied to teachings of our Lord. In the only instance where the three Synoptists agree in this, the word is used by Christ Himself in the records of Matthew and Mark, while Luke uses this word in relating the incident. The case is that in which Christ utilized the budding of the Fig-tree, with its promise of the summer, as a type of signs which should herald the destruction of Jerusalem. This was for His apostles the parable which the Fig-tree had to teach, and in its limited reference to their personal guidance, we see that which marks it off from the more general teachings of the parabolic sequence. Both Matthew and Mark relate, that Christ's statement about the things that defile—not that which entereth into the mouth, but that which proceedeth out of it—perplexed His disciples, and that they took occasion to ask an explanation of 'the parable.' This term is in all likelihood used here in regard to a lesson, which, while clear to us, had its confessed obscurity for the disciples. Mark introduces Christ's illustrations of the divided kingdom, and strong man's house, by saying that He here spake in parables. But clearly in this case the word is used in its sense of a proverb. The other instances of its

use in the Gospels all occur in Luke, and it is no less obviously in the proverbial sense, that this evangelist applies it to Christ's illustration of the blind leading the blind, and His reference to the folly of patching old cloth with new, or of putting new wine into old skins. This is made the more obvious in the case of these latter references, as they form but appendices to the more distinctly parabolic illustration of the bridegroom's party (Children of the Bridechamber), not here designated parable, but, with its accompanying illustrations, expounded by Dr. Bruce as such.

Christ's gracious counsel about choosing seats at feasts, in the course of His table-talk as the Sabbath guest of a ruler of the Pharisees, has alike in view of its expanded form, and the more than merely moral lesson which it inculcates, more claim to the designation given it than these others, although it is but a minor parable. It lies at least on the boundary line between the proverb and the evangelic parable, and has been so dealt with by Dr. Bruce. But Christ's teaching associated rather confusedly with a Faithful Steward, and Faithful and Unfaithful Servants, in connexion with which Peter asked the pertinent question, 'Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or unto all,' is of all the minor parables in Luke that most entitled to the name. Peter's inquiry, indeed, indicates the one limitation which excludes it from a place among the thirty. For its apparent reference is to degenerate ministers of the kingdom, and the manner in which Peter's question is dealt with gives every encouragement to this view of it. It is a parable for the apostles to begin with, and after them for those of some authority and eminence in the Church.

But in view of the varied character of even these seven Gospel-named parables, it is clearly desirable that we should have some criterion by which to distinguish between the really essential and important parables, and the subordinate elements in the parabolic utterances of our Lord. We have already noted and discussed the subject common to the thirty parables which have formed the basis of our investigations in regard to the parabolic doctrine. That we have seen to be the soul of man. And we may now add that in this common subject of these thirty parables, there is that which marks them off from almost all the lesser parables and metaphoric teachings of Jesus. It is the special feature of the parallel sequence of parables which has occupied our attention, that they all, and practically alone, deal with man's spiritual nature and career in its fullest scope.

It is, on the other hand, an equally distinctive mark of the Johannine parables or allegories, that their common subject is the nature, person, functions, and relationships of Christ. It is His work and person they set before us, just as the Synoptic parables depict for us the natural state and development of man's immortal soul Now, with a very few exceptions, the lesser parables, the metaphors, and the similes of the Synoptic Gospels are outside of both these categories. The one metaphor found in the Synoptists which answers to the Johannine type of parable is that of the Physician, whose aid the sick need but not the whole, although in the Sower, the Shepherd, the Landlord's Son, and the Bridegroom of the greater parables, we find subordinate figures of this reference.

The Parable of the Watchful Porter, reported by Mark alone, which has more of the true parable character about it than any other outside our thirty, and that of the Faithful and Unfaithful Servants, reported by Matthew and Luke, and to which we have already referred, are the only other parables in any way fitted for inclusion among those relating to general features of man's spiritual nature. The former seems to combine the lessons of diligence and vigilance, taught separately in the Matthean parables of the Talents, and the Ten Virgins, and may be regarded as Mark's equivalent for them. The Parable of the Faithful and Unfaithful Servants treats also of vigilance, here associated with fidelity, but this, as we have seen, with a limited reference.

With these exceptions we may safely say that no minor parables or metaphors in the Synoptic records can at all be associated with the great parables which give us the story of man's spiritual career. Many of them deal with some feature or aspect of this matter, but invariably with a limitation of their reference, which at once removes them from the main stream of Christ's parabolic teaching. Thus that little triad, setting forth the fresh joyous spirit of Christ's followers, in connexion with the figures of a bridal party, a patch on an old garment, and new wine in old skins, has a very obvious reference to those associated with our Lord, during the time of His earthly ministry, although not without its lessons for all time, in

regard to a notable feature of the Christian faith. The conduct of the Children in the Marketplace is distinctly applied by Christ to those contemporaries of His, whom neither He nor the Baptist could please. The figures of the Divided Kingdom, and of the Strong Man whose house is threatened by robbers, descriptive as they are of Satan's discomfiture at the hands of our Lord, were made use of to show the absurdity of the Pharisaic charge that Christ was inspired by Beelzebub. And the figure of the blossoming Fig-tree was drawn attention to as significant of omens, which, for His disciples' guidance, should precede the destruction of Jerusalem.

But while clearly outside of the more general and important parabolic doctrine, Christ's metaphoric teaching, as distinct from or subordinate to that, is when attentively studied, not without its own striking and suggestive features. Thus the fact that of the sixty metaphoric figures to be found throughout the Synoptic Gospels, two-thirds occur in Matthew's record previous to the chapter which contains Christ's first reported parables, would seem to indicate a development from their frequent use in Christ's discourse to a preference for the more elaborate parable. For with the more frequent appearance of the parable in Matthew's later pages, the lesser metaphoric figures almost wholly disappear.

Then another striking feature is, that while the parables of Luke's Gospel are with very few exceptions not those of Matthew's, there are only four of the subordinate metaphors found in Matthew which are not in Luke, these being the Pearls before swine, Wolves in sheep's clothing, Gnat-strainers, and Sheep and Goats. And, on the other hand, there are only four teachings in this form to be found in Luke, which are not in Matthew, these being the Ploughman looking back, the Servants awaiting their master, the Tower builder, and the Warring king. Luke alone records that proverb-like 'parable' about the Seats at feasts, while omitting that reported by Mark and Matthew about true defilement, of heart and mouth.

In regard to the literary form in which these threescore figures appear, we discover on analysis, that seventeen are similes in which the comparison or resemblance is stated, thirty-two are metaphors in which resemblance or identification is implied or assumed, and eleven have claims to be considered allegories if not parables, on the score of the resemblance for which the figures stand being only suggested.

Some two dozen of these figurative teachings are distinctly proverbial in character, basing the lesson taught in itself, or at least through the metaphor employed, on an obviously natural law, reasonable principle, or sagacious maxim. These appeals to necessities of thought or action are most pointed in their lessons, and very variously derived in their illustrations. Thus inanimate nature is made to preach through the good and bad fruit of wholesome and poisonous plants, through weather portents, and the heralds of approaching summer, as well as through the savour of salt, and the fermentation of wine. Man's own body has its lessons for him in the danger of retaining a diseased limb, and the drawbacks of darkened or distorted vision, as also in the sick man's need of the physician. The impossibility of serving two opposing masters, of building securely on sand, of passing a tall or laden camel through a low or narrow archway, or of abstracting a mote from another's eye while a chip is in one's own, are all employed to enforce spiritual truths. So too are the absurdities of putting pearls before swine, a lamp under a bushel, new wine in old skins, or a patch of new cloth on a fusty robe. No less unfitting things are set before us in the ploughman with his back to the plough, the unarmed thief attacking the defended house, or the householder leaving it open to him, the king building a tower or engaging in war without counting the cost or considering his resources, or the divided kingdom hoping long to stand. That men have more value than sheep, that prophets are least thought of at home, that man's true defilement is from within, and that even in festive gatherings he that humbleth himself shall be exalted, are also proverbial teachings given more or less in metaphoric guise.

Those metaphors which come nearest to the parables in their teaching, depict, under most suggestive emblems, varied aspects and functions of the Christian life. The first we come across, after that of the implied subjects of the kingdom which Christ began by proclaiming, is found in the phrase 'fishers of men,' so aptly applied to those whom He called from their nets to be the apostles of His saving mission to mankind. The Sermon on the Mount furnishes us with a pair in the

designations 'salt of the earth,' and 'lights of the world,' in connexion with which Christ calls on His disciples to be savoury, and to let their light shine. As travellers in the narrow way, yoke-fellows and cross-bearers with their Lord, stewards of a rich treasury, heirs of heavenly wealth, learners under a great teacher, reapers in the spiritual harvest field, clavigers of Christ's kingdom, His near relatives and God's children, we have a rich quarry of titles for stimulating thought, in regard to the duties, responsibilities, and rewards of Christ's service. Its joy is set forth in the figure of a bridal party, its risks in that of lambs amid wolves, its call for vigilance in those of the watchful porter, and servants awaiting their master, and withal its very serious nature in that of sharer's of Christ's own cup.

Another class of metaphors adds to the emblems in which the parabolic teaching sets forth the great distinction of the right and wrong, the good and bad. These are presented in such contrasts as that of the broad and narrow ways, the wise and foolish builders, the good and corrupt trees, man's two possible masters, the single and evil-eyed, the passing possessions of earth and the saint's enduring heritage in heaven, and in sheep and goats as emblematic of the final separation of the good and evil.

Not a few forcible figures relating to the opposers of Christ's work in His own day, and no less applicable to many since, are found among the Gospel metaphors. Than the Pharisaic leaven of hypocrisy, nothing more aroused our Lord's righteous indignation, and it is against such deceivers that terms like these are used, 'wolves in sheep's clothing,' 'a temple den of robbers,' 'strainers at gnats and gulpers of camels,' 'weeds' (unplanted growths), 'blind leaders of the blind,' and 'whited sepulchres.'

A significant series of metaphors is that which relates to, and depicts the course of possible degeneracy and apostasy in Christ's disciples. There is the risk for all converts of the dispossessed demon's return. There is the perilous looking back of him who has put his hand to the plough. There is the no less dangerous concealment of the light lit for illumination. There is the injurious limb which may require amputation. There are the temptations for trusted servants, in the master's absence, to become careless, unfaithful, and riotous with the drunken. And there is the worthless salt that has lost its savour.

But if these natural figures are utilized for the disciple's warning, he is not left without his inspiration and his comfort from the realm of nature too. While man's natural hunger is utilized to remind him of the soul hunger he should have for righteousness, his parental affections and the kindnesses they prompt to, are made use of to encourage his faith in the Fatherly love and goodness of God, and in the daily expectation of receiving good things from Him. The birds of the air and the flowers of the field are pointed to, that man may learn from their case to trust his Maker for needful food and raiment. He is reminded that no sparrow falls to the ground overlooked by God, and that the very hairs of his head are numbered by Him who numbereth the stars.

But there is a side of this teaching from nature profoundly pathetic, because set to remind us of the saving work for man, of nature's Lord and Divine Expositor. Every bird's nest and fox covert has its reminder of Him who for man's sake had not where to lay His head, while the hen with her chickens about her has her tale to tell us of His protecting love. And in the bread and wine which nature's harvests bring us, we may see the divinely appointed memorials of His broken body and shed blood, and thus be feelingly reminded by the very staff of life, that man doth not live by bread alone.

The Synoptic metaphors and similes are thus seen to be capable of division into quite a few distinctly marked classes, subordinate to and serving to set forth the details of that divine service, to which so many of the greater parables more generally refer. And when so regarded, we recognize the helpful relation which their subordinate lessons bear to the more general parabolic teaching. Nor can we overlook the fact, as significant of the value of these metaphors, that it is under the emblem of the kingdom of God, that these Synoptic Gospellers depict Christ as setting forth the great boon He came to bestow, the *summum bonum* of all possible desire.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF I. CORINTHIANS.

I. Cor. iv. 5.

Wherefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God.—R.V.

1. The doctrine of judgment was inherited by the Church from the Synagogue. In the Old Testament we can trace its gradual development, and in the apocalyptic literature, which was so copiously produced in the age immediately preceding the Advent of Christ, it attained remarkable prominence and distinctiveness. The New Testament takes up the tradition of Jewish doctrine, and makes to it an addition of the utmost importance by identifying the Lord of the prophets with the Lord Jesus Christ. Our Saviour clearly claimed for Himself the character of the Judge of mankind, and connected His Second Advent with the exercise of His judicial functions. The process of judgment is variously presented in the Gospels. In St. Matthew's Gospel the objective aspect is most emphasized, and we have the picture of 'the great Assize,' when 'the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him,' and shall pass sentence on 'all the nations.' In the Fourth Gospel Christ is represented as judging men inevitably by His word, which they receive or reject by an act of self-revelation. In one place we read that the Father 'hath given all judgment unto the Son'; and in another place of the same Gospel Christ is represented as disclaiming the purpose of judgment: 'I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.' The judgment proceeds as the natural consequence of His presence and teaching: 'He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day.' Thus the process of judgment is at once present and future. Day by day men judge themselves, but there is a 'last day' of final judgment, in which the tenor and effect of those unconscious self-judgments shall be declared. It is not altogether easy to combine these notions of judgment, but the Christian doctrine includes both, and can dispense with neither.

If we study carefully the Old Testament, we shall distinguish a twofold process of development in the doctrine of judgment. On the one hand, the Jews were gradually led to move from the notion of national to that of individual judgment. On the other hand, they were led to transfer the scene of final judgment from this life to the next, and to seek the triumph of Jehovah's righteousness not in time but in eternity. This twofold doctrinal advance was determined by the teaching of the prophets about God, and was assisted at every stage by the circumstances of the national history. As we study the writings of the Old Testament, we are conscious of a steady movement away from primitive and materialistic conceptions of the Godhead towards an ever more spiritual conception. In the greater prophets of Israel's later history we have attained to a Theistic belief which, until the Revelation in the Incarnate Son, cannot be transcended. It was on the basis of that prophetic Theism that Jesus Christ could prefer His own supreme claim on human faith: 'Ye believe in God,' He said, 'believe also in me.'

When we pass from the Old Testament to the New, we perceive that the prophetic doctrine is developed in two directions. In the first place, Jesus Christ is declared to be the Divine Judge of men. If in preaching to the Jews the Apostles were wont to place most emphasis on His Messiahship, in preaching to the Gentiles they insisted most on His judgeship. In the one case they were appealing to religious expectations rooted in the Scriptures, in the other they were addressing themselves to the conscience, stained and troubled with the consciousness of guilt. Messiahship, however, in the apocalyptic doctrine, included judgeship; and the Messianic Judge was clothed with Divine attributes. St. Paul does not hesitate to apply to our Saviour that term 'the Lord,' which, as a student of the Septuagint, he was accustomed to apply to Jehovah. The Divine Judgment which the prophets had taught him to expect was identified with that judgment of Christ which the evangelists assert that Christ Himself announced. This judgment would take place at the Parousia, or Second Advent of Christ, which the Apostolic

Church so ardently longed for, and which they believed was so near at hand. In the next place, the Divine Judgment was held to be primarily a judgment of individuals. This faith and longing sobered and strengthened them. Words which even now carry a solemn message were then heavily freighted with constraining counsel: 'We must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad.'

2. This is the judgment to which St. Paul now appeals. For this judgment he bids the Corinthians wait. The Church at Corinth was honeycombed by the characteristic Greek vice of party spirit. The three great teachers, Paul, Peter, Apollos, were pitted against each other, and each was unduly exalted by those who swore by him, and unduly depreciated by the other two factions. But the men whose names were the war-cries of these sections were themselves knit in closest friendship, and felt themselves to be servants in common of one Master, and fellow-workers in one task. So Paul, in the immediate context, associating Peter and Apollos with himself, bids the Corinthians think of '*us*' as being servants of Christ, and not therefore responsible to men; as stewards of the mysteries of God, that is, dispensers of truths long hidden but now revealed, and as therefore accountable for correct accounts and faithful dispensation only to the Lord of the household. Being responsible to Him, they heeded very little what others thought about them. Being responsible to Him, they could not accept vindication by their own consciences as being final. There was a judgment beyond these.

¶ Judgment to come is one of those things that need only to be wisely *asserted*. It does not need to be proved. Conscience will do that.[1]

¶ How shall the World be judged and by whom? Jesus Christ, that Word of God Which became Man, shall by the Power of His divine Stirring or Motion separate from Himself all that belongeth not to Him.[2]

Let us consider—

I. The Quality of Christ's Judgment.
   i. Perfect in Knowledge.
   ii. Perfect in Equity.
II. The Time of it.

[1] Principal Rainy, *Life*, i. 131.
[2] Jacob Behmen.

I.

The Quality of Christ's Judgment.

Think of the difference between God's judgment and man's judgment. Think how rapidly human judgments are formed, on what slight and external evidence; compare them with the judgment of absolute knowledge, which does not arrive at a decision by argument, by inference, by weighing probabilities, but by simply knowing every secret of every life. Again, human judgment deals with *crime*, with definite laws broken by definite acts; it condemns what is dangerous to society, what disturbs the peace of social life. The Divine judgment deals with *sin*, with thoughts and wishes and deeds unknown by our fellows, it condemns all that is unholy, all that is impure, all that is unworthy of those who are called to be the sons of God. Again, human judgment cannot make distinctions and consider the circumstances of those whom it judges—the man who commits the crime is the criminal, and must suffer for his act. It matters not that he was ignorant, or trained in habits of vice, nor how strong a temptation was created for him by the circumstances in which he was placed. Yet surely the judgment of an all-wise Father is very different from this, and many a criminal may win pardon from his God, which he can never obtain from his fellow-men.

> Who made the heart, 'tis He alone
> Decidedly can try us;
> He knows each chord, its various tone;
> Each spring, its various bias.
> Then at the balance let's be mute,
> We never can adjust it;
> What's done we partly may compute,
> But know not what's resisted.[3]

i. Perfect Knowledge.

1. God knows the state of our hearts to the bottom, and this no man knows about himself. God not only knows all the good and evil we have done, but all we are capable of doing. Some of us may, before this time next year, do things which, if whispered to us now, would call forth the angry retort, 'Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?' On the other hand, there are those who will, within a year, perform acts of heroic faith and love which they would not now believe, though a man should show them unto them. We never know what is in us, or what manner of men we are,

[3] Burns, *Address to the Unco Guid*.

till the trial comes. The circumstances of our lot, the restraints of home and the habits of the society in which we move, produce virtues in us which are utterly destitute of root. Many a one, of the fairest fame and promise in his native place, has no suspicion how shallow his character is till he finds himself in new circumstances, with restraint removed and temptation strong, when his goodness decays like Jonah's gourd and there is a rush of vicious growths from the soil of the heart.

¶ The conduct that issues from a moral conflict has often so close a resemblance to vice that the distinction escapes all outward judgments, founded on a mere comparison of actions.[1]

¶ He was a light sentence judge. He could hardly imagine, he once said from the Bench, 'any circumstances in connection with the stealing of a shawl which would justify any bench of magistrates in taking seven years off a man's life.' Brutal judges are usually unimaginative men, who dole out sentences of slavery as if they were selling tape by the yard. Active as always was Lockwood's imagination, he was also a man of great self-control, and the only cases that really tried his judicial temper were those of cruelty to children.[2]

¶ He who shall pass judgment on the records of our life is the same that formed us in frailty.[3]

2. One reason which makes a true judgment of the real moral condition of a fellow-creature so difficult, is our necessary ignorance of all his circumstances. If circumstances do not decide our actions—and they certainly do not, the human will being what it is—they do, nevertheless, influence us very seriously. Natural temperament is sometimes a protection, sometimes a temptation; home is sometimes a temple of holiness, sometimes a very furnace of evil; education may be a training for heaven, it may also be a training which would make heaven odious if it were attainable. The balance of passions in one man's physical frame; the balance of natural qualities in the understanding and heart of another; the grace which has been given, or which has not been given; the friends who have been near us, at critical times in our lives, to give our career a good or, it may be, a fatal turn, by a word in season, or a sneer, or an innuendo never since then forgotten—all these things enter into the serious question, How far do circumstances excuse or exaggerate our guilt; how far do they account for or enhance what there is of good in us? Who of us would dare, with his eyes open, to attempt an answer in the case of any human being whom we know? One Eye alone can take a full and equitable account of circumstances. He knew what had been the circumstances of the penitent thief, when He said, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.' He knew what had been the circumstances of Judas, when He said, 'Good were it for that man if he had not been born.' As for us we do not know, we only guess at, the real sum of circumstances, inward and outward, of any human life; and therefore we had better 'judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come.'

¶ It is with men as with trees: if you lop off their finest branches, into which they were pouring their young life-juice, the wounds will be healed over with some rough boss, some odd excrescence; and what might have been a grand tree expanding into liberal shade is but a whimsical misshapen trunk. Many an irritating fault, many an unlovely oddity, has come of a hard sorrow, which has crushed and maimed the nature just when it was expanding into plenteous beauty; and the trivial erring life which we visit with our harsh blame, may be but as the unsteady motion of a man whose best limb is withered.[4]

¶ In the year 1896 an Italian general was walking along the road, and met a private, whose buff uniform and blue cloak showed many marks of wear and tear. You could guess, by the worn dress and the man's tanned face, that he had lately served in the war with the Abyssinians. But the private passed by the general without raising his hand to salute. The officer was offended. He turned round, and inquired the reason. The soldier gave a jerk with his shoulders and threw back the blue cloak. A sad sight showed itself. The man had no arms; the savage Abyssinians had cut them off. Tears filled the general's eyes. He embraced the soldier, and promised to take care of him.[5]

When thou shalt stand, a naked shivering soul,
  Stripped of thy shows and trappings, made most bare
  Of all the fleshly glory thou didst wear—
And hear the thunder of God's Judgment roll
Above thy head; while to their hard-won goal
His own elect ascend the golden stair—
  What plea wilt proffer, when, too late for pray'r,
Of thy lost life thou see'st the sum and whole?

'I have no armour dinted by the fight,
  No broken sword, no casque with cloven rim;
Was none to witness to the grisly sight,
  For all alone we strove in darkness dim;
Yet in the Valley of Death, O Lord, one night,
  I met Apollyon and I vanquished him.'[6]

3. St. Paul describes the knowledge of Christ as (1) bringing to light the hidden things of darkness, and (2) making manifest the counsels of the hearts. When our Lord comes back it will be, not only to

[1] George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*.
[2] A. Birrell, *Life of Sir Frank Lockwood*, 99.
[3] R. L. Stevenson, *Master of Ballantrae*.
[4] George Eliot, *Mr. Gilfil's Love Story*.
[5] F. J. Gould, *The Children's Book of Moral Lessons*, 150.
[6] May Byron, *The Wind on the Heath*, 65.

reckon with His servants, not only to pass the everlasting sentence on all that we have done, but to show what has been in all hearts and thoughts, and to take away the veil of darkness which covers so many things in our lives from the knowledge of all the world. We all of us have our secrets: and we must be prepared one day to give them up. 'For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops.' These are the words of Christ, and they are repeated over and over again. And St. Paul is constantly reminding us of the same thing. It is not only that 'every one of us shall give account of himself to God.' It is not only that 'we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ.' It is not only that God 'will render to every man according to his deeds'; it is also that God, in that day, 'shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.' 'Some men's sins,' he says, 'are open beforehand, going before to judgment; and some men they follow after. Likewise also the good works of some are manifest beforehand; and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.' That is, not only is there nothing, whether good or bad, but shall come under God's judgment; but there is nothing, whether open or hidden, notorious or unknown, but, in that day, shall be published.

(1) *The hidden things of darkness.*—There is no difficulty in understanding what is meant by bringing to light the hidden things of darkness. We know what it is when something which we wish to hide is found out. We know what it is when something which we have wished to keep in the deepest darkness gets abroad, and is in every one's mouth. Now this is what the Apostle tells us is to happen with all the secrets in the day when the Lord comes to judgment. Secrets may be kept for a long time, but they cannot be kept for ever. The day must come at last when they shall be known: we cannot tell by whom; but, at any rate, by those from whom people wished to hide them. Who are to be the witnesses of that great exposure, before whom all our secrets are to be dragged into light and our souls laid bare, it is useless to guess. All we know is the awful fact—the awfulness of which we can partly imagine by what we feel *now*, —that we shall have to give up everything that lies hid in our hearts and knowledge; that it will be impossible to hide anything, or keep it secret any longer; that if there is anything which we should be ashamed of being known, we shall no longer be able to help its being discovered and disclosed; that then every man will be seen as he is; the truth about everything will be made clear, the light will have poured in, brighter than the sun at noonday, on all dark places, and all dark things, and words.

¶ The Rev. R. C. Gillie in his *Little Sermons to Children* tells of a lighthouse keeper who slept at his post, and allowed the machinery that caused the light to revolve to run down. At once he started it again, and, peering into the night, could not detect the light of a single vessel in the Channel. It seemed as if his fault had passed unnoticed, so, after waiting for a day or two to see if anything came of it, he finally decided to make no mention of his lapse in the official log book. The days broadened into weeks. 'I am safe,' he cried. And indeed, as the months passed on, the incident began to fade from his memory.

Four months after this night, a captain of a P. & O. steamer, just returned from an Australian voyage, sat at a public dinner next an official of the Trinity House, which has charge of the lighthouses on the English coast. As the conversation lulled a little, the Captain looked up and said, 'By the way, when did your people make Stony Cliff a fixed light?' 'Stony Cliff a fixed light?' replied his companion, 'you are dreaming. It always has been, and is still a revolving light.' 'Well,' said the Captain, 'when I took my steamer down the Channel four months ago, I passed Stony Cliff at two in the morning: the light was fixed, and I can bring witnesses to prove it.' 'Ah—' said the official, as light dawned on him, 'will you be good enough to give me the day and hour on which you passed?' The captain saw then what was in his companion's mind, but it was too late to draw back, and the particulars were duly given.

Next morning an inspector was posting down from London to Stony Cliff Lighthouse, to dismiss the keeper on the spot.

(2) *The counsels of the hearts.*—One part of this great revealing of secrets will be the discovery of men's real character, the revelation of what each man really is. Now, this is only half known. We think that we are something or other; and other people think of us according to their views. But all the time we are what we are in the eyes of God; that which God sees us to be, that we are whatever different thing we may fancy of ourselves, or others may fancy of us. Now, we mistake about ourselves; and do not know what our neighbours have found out about us. We think ourselves one thing; they, with their sharper eyes, or more impartial judgment, see that we are another. We, perhaps, think ourselves humble; they see that we

are vain. We think, perhaps, that religion is the main thing in all we do; they see that, behind all our religion, our actions are worldly and selfish. They see that we are cowardly, and we fancy ourselves manly and brave. We never doubt that we are true: they see that we are slippery and insincere. They see that we are ill-natured and ill-tempered, while we never imagine that such a charge can be made against us. Now, to all this the day of the Lord will put an end. Then, all mistakes, all disguises, will be at an end. We shall be forced to know and see what we really are. If we are conceited, and selfish, and self-indulgent, and untrue, we shall be made to know it. We shall see ourselves as we have appeared to other eyes. And all those secret faults and sins which we have, perhaps, taken so much trouble to wrap up and hide, which we have known of ourselves, but hoped that no one else suspected,—these, too, must be shown in their true light. We must for once—we must at last—be seen as we are. We shall feel that wilful blindness to ourselves, that all shows and pretendings, are at an end. Our real character will be made clear. The truth about us will have to come out. As Almighty God knows us, so we shall, at last, know ourselves, and so we shall be known by all who then see us.

ii. Perfect Equity.

The man whom God sees in us is different from the man whom we see in ourselves, because we are prejudiced in our own favour, while He is quite impartial. The public may sometimes judge a man more truly than his friends, because the latter are too partial. And who can have any doubt that his friends see defects in his character to which he is himself completely blind? Our self-conceit will sometimes even make us proud of qualities for which we are the pity and laughing-stock of all who know us. Thus is our own judgment of ourselves distorted by prejudice; but God judges us impartially.

1. One reason which makes it difficult for all of us to judge the characters, as distinct from the acts, of other men equitably is this; we are seldom, if ever, without a strong bias ourselves. We have, as the phrase goes, our likes and dislikes; and only those who have a very strong sense of justice try to keep these tendencies well in hand before they speak or act in relation to others. We perhaps flatter ourselves that we really dislike only that which is evil, or which we believe to be so. Goodness often comes to us in a very unattractive garb, with a rough manner and a coarse address; we think too much of the garb to do justice to that which it shrouds. Evil comes to us dressed up in the best possible taste, with the tone and distinction of good society everywhere apparent in its movement and expression; and we shut our eyes to its real character for the sake of its outward charm. Are we sure that we always welcome virtue, even when it is not presented to us disagreeably? Just let us reflect that, whether we know it or not, each of us has a weak side, as we call it; a tendency to some one kind of sin. If we watch ourselves, we are pretty sure to discover that this tendency exerts a subtle influence on our judgments of others. We do not heartily welcome virtues which we instinctively feel condemn ourselves. If our tendency be to vanity, we find it hard to do justice to the humble; if to sloth or sensuality, we disparage the ascetic; if to untruthfulness, we make fun of the scrupulously accurate; if to uncharitableness, we vote those who say the best they can of their neighbours dull company. We assume, without exactly knowing what we do, that the virtues which cost us little or nothing to practise are the most important virtues, and that the vices which contradict them ought to be judged with the greatest severity. We think little of, or at any rate less of, those portions of the Divine Law which we find it hard to obey, or perhaps do not obey; we are disposed to treat violations of them in others with great tenderness. Who does not see that a bias like this disqualifies us for honest, equitable judgment of character, and that it warns us not to judge character before the time, until the Lord come?

¶ 'All friends shall taste the wages of their virtue, and all foes the cup of their deservings,' says Shakespeare, feeling that it must be so, but barely making us feel that it is so, since Cordelia is dead as well as Regan and Goneril—since Lear is mad and dies, as well as Edmund, and Gloucester's heart bursts, and the poor fool is hanged; and, in short, as in *Hamlet*, the end is dismal—'quarry cries on havoc.' Judgment hardly seems to sit in state, but rather, 'proud death to have a feast toward in his eternal cell.' You are, nevertheless, made to feel, in the seeming confusion of outward award of good and ill, that you would infinitely prefer to be good and affectionate and true with Edgar, and shiver with him in his rags and misery, than leap into the proud position of an Edmund, and face the outraged conscience. And Edmund himself feels it. Before he dies, he must

worship goodness. 'Some good I mean to do.' Who would not choose to be with Cordelia in exile, rather than with Regan and Goneril at the head of the government? She is drawn somehow, it looks, into the general judgment—basely strangled in prison; but there is a judgment within a judgment. And the inner judgment which is brought to light is this, that Cordelia had preserved the jewel of her womanliness; Goneril and Regan had 'foredone themselves.' The perplexity of outward events, and the promiscuousness of the common fate on the outside, turn us sometimes away from this truth, which the Christian Church has steadily kept in view, and the discernment of which, through whatever confusion, is the mark of greatness in a man. It is this that places Job so far beyond his friends; and although he may fail sometimes in argument, we can see throughout that he has the right of the matter; and if the book does not give the clearest idea possible of a great human and religious fact,—for absolute correctness and exact measurement are not to be spoken of in this connexion,—it gives one of the profoundest readings of that fact anywhere to be met with.[1]

II.

The Time of the Judgment.

Of the time and manner of the judgment which Christ pronounces on us we know very little. We are led, however, to infer that it is both present and future; and it is timeless.

1. *It is present.*—'He that judgeth me,' says St. Paul in the previous verse, 'is the Lord.' 'He that *judgeth* me'—not, 'will judge,' but *now*, at this very moment. That is to say, whilst people round us are passing their superficial estimates upon us, and whilst my conscience is excusing, or else accusing me—and in neither case with absolute infallibility—there is another judgment, running concurrently with them, and going on in silence. That calm eye is fixed upon me, and sifting me, and knowing me. *That* judgment is not fallible, because before Him 'the hidden things' that the darkness shelters are all manifest; and to Him the 'counsels of the heart,' that is, the motives from which the actions flow, are all transparent and legible. So His judgment, the continual estimate of me which Jesus Christ, in His supreme knowledge of me, has, at every moment of my life—*that* is uttering the final word about me and my character.

¶ Christ came into the world, not in order to judge it, but still for judgment; to be by the mere action of men their test. And still, though He cometh not to judge and condemn by His mouth, He is in the world 'for judgment'; by His presence we are disclosed in our true state; and by our attitude towards Him and thought of Him, not only is our present condition manifested, but also our state and position in the universe are determined. This position is more than made known, it is altered and fixed by the movement of our minds concerning Christ, and by our judgment of Him. What think ye of Christ? This is the question of really vital importance; of vital importance, not for Him but for us.

Jesus Christ has come into the world, and is in the world a light, and the real truth is not that He is waiting for the world's favourable verdict, although this is the way in which the case presents itself to the public; but, in fact, the public and the nations, the Churches and the individuals, stand before the Lord and are being judged although not by His will or voice. A day is coming when He will declare His judgment, but now, 'If any man hear my sayings, and keep them not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.' At the end, the rejected Word, 'the same shall judge him in the last day.' Now He is silent, and we think that we judge Him; but in truth we are judging ourselves by our attitude towards Him.

The same diversity between the real and the apparent judicial situation may be seen constantly in common life. A country servant cannot imagine that Sir Frederick Roberts is a general—I am thinking of a real incident in the days of his Afghan campaign—he 'is not big enough.' The good servant is not adjudging our hero his place in the roll of great commanders but is indicating the extent of the servant's knowledge of what constitutes a general.[2]

¶ Is there but one day of judgment? Why, for us every day is a day of judgment—every day is a Dies Iræ, and writes its irrevocable verdict in the flame of its West. Think you that judgment waits till the doors of the grave are opened? It waits at the doors of your houses—it waits at the corners of your streets; we are in the midst of judgment—the insects that we crush are our judges—the moments we fret away are our judges—the elements that feed us, judge, as they minister—and the pleasures that deceive us, judge, as they indulge. Let us, for our lives, do the work of Men while we bear the form of them, if indeed those lives are *Not* as a vapour, and do *Not* vanish away.[3]

2. *It is also future.*—We take our belief in the Divine judgment from the lips of the Divine Judge Himself, and He declares that His judgment is severely individual, and shall be finally exercised in the life to come. We have to look forward to the Judgment Day, and therein to a severe inquisition into our own lives, a bringing home to ourselves of the whole meaning and consequence of moral responsibility. Difficult it may be, nay, assuredly is, for us to take the full significance of the pictorial language of the Gospel. In parting from the old literalism, let us hold fast to the truth which it contained. We have no satisfying formula for our belief, and must perforce

[1] W. Horne, *Religious Life and Thought*, 94.

[2] P. N. Waggett, *The Age of Decision*, 85.

[3] Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies* (*Works*, xviii. 180).

make shift with the only formula we have; but as to the core of truth, which that formula aspires to utter, there can be no possible doubt. We must surely be judged, and judged by Christ. Our temporal action has eternal consequences; we must render account to our Creator for what we have done, and for what we have become.

¶ Are you sure there is a heaven? Sure there is a hell? Sure that men are dropping before your faces through the pavements of these streets into eternal fire, or sure that they are not? Sure that at your own death you are going to be delivered from all sorrow, to be endowed with all virtue, to be gifted with all felicity, and raised into perpetual companionship with a King, compared to whom the kings of the earth are as grasshoppers, and the nations as the dust of His feet? Are you sure of this? or, if not sure, do any of us so much as care to make it sure? and, if not, how can anything that we do be right—how can anything we think be wise? what honour can there be in the arts that amuse us, or what profit in the possessions that please?[1]

[1] Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies* (*Works*, xviii. 155).

Recent Biblical and Oriental Archaeology.

By the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Assyriology in the University of Oxford.

Professor R. W. Rogers' *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1912) has been long expected, and now that it has appeared it more than fulfils our expectations. It is just the book that was wanted both by scholars and by Old Testament readers. It will take the place occupied twenty years ago by Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, which has never been filled since. Professor Rogers has spared no pains to bring his work up to date, and to give all the information 'the ordinary man' wants. Like all his other work, moreover, his book is distinguished not only by sound historical knowledge, but also by sound historical judgment and common sense, which are too frequently lacking in modern books on the same subject.

He has followed Schrader's example in giving the transliterated cuneiform text together with a translation of it. The two, in fact, cannot well be separated owing to the nature of the cuneiform script, the reading of which depends so largely on the meaning we assign to it. Unlike Schrader, however, he has added Assyro-Babylonian parallels to other Old Testament subjects besides history and geography, hymns and prayers as well as liturgical and doctrinal texts and mythological poems being included in his work. On the other hand, he has not traced in detail the relationship between his cuneiform extracts and the Old Testament passages which they illustrate or explain. I hope he is reserving this for a second volume; there is no one better qualified for such a task, and it would meet with a general welcome.

The earlier part of the book is occupied with the Mythological Texts—the story of the Creation, the myth of the first man Adamu (not Adapa, as Professor Rogers continues to write the name, after the Germans), the Babylonian accounts of the Deluge, and other old legends of the same kind. Then we have selections from the multitudinous hymns and psalms and prayers of ancient Babylonia, which include the Babylonian 'Negative Confession' and fragments of the 'Wisdom Literature'; this is followed by some Liturgical and Doctrinal texts, among them being one relating to the Scape-goat, while the latter half of the book is occupied with history, and concludes with a translation of the very important Code of Khammu-rabi. The book is so good that the best compliment I can pay to it is to indicate some of the passages in it where we do not see alike, or where I think his rendering can be improved. There was no such kingdom, for instance, as 'Patin.' The Assyrian characters should be read Khattinâ, 'the Hittites,' who were a fragment of the old Hittite empire left stranded on the Gulf of Antioch: the name of the kingdom was Unqi. The idea that the Yaudâ over whom Azariah was king in the time of Tiglath-pileser IV. belonged to northern Syria must be given up; it rested on an erroneous reading of Scheil in the Tel el-Amarna tablets. King's view again is certainly wrong, that the reading of his Chronicle, which makes Sargon of Akḳad cross 'the sea of the East,' is to be preferred to the reading of the older version of the Babylonian monarch's annals, 'the sea of the

West': the Chronicle is its own witness against itself, as it goes on to state that the result of crossing the sea was the subjection of 'the country of the West in its full extent.' Is Khallab in the Prologue of the Laws of Khammu-rabi really Aleppo? There was a Khallab in Babylonia, and it is more natural to suppose that this is the city intended, rather than a distant Syrian town whose name is elsewhere written Khal-ma-na in the cuneiform texts. Budu-yaman, finally, in the fragmentary annals of Nebuchadnezzar, should be corrected into Puṭu-yavan, 'Phut of the Ionians.' Cyrene is meant, of which Laarchus or Polyarchus was king, though all that is left of his name in the cuneiform tablet is the last syllable—*kû*. It was from Cyrene that the Egyptian Pharaoh Amasis drew at the time part of his troops.

In his transliteration and translation of the interesting letter discovered by Dr. Bliss at Lachish, Professor Rogers has followed Dr. Knudtzon. Knudtzon's readings, however, are not altogether correct, as I found on a re-examination of the cuneiform original; the impossible name 'Pabi,' for example, has no existence. The following is my translation of the tablet:—

'[To . . .] the officer thus says [Ilu ?-] abi: At thy feet I prostrate myself. Verily thou knowest that Dan-Hadad and Zimrida have made conspiracy (?) together, and Dan-Hadad says to Zimrida: "Send Isyara to me, O my father, [and] give me [3 ?] shields (?) and 3 slings and 3 falchions. I am gone out against the country of the king, and it has acted against me, but now I will get it back. As regards the scheme, he who has devised the scheme is Ilu-abu; send him therefore unto me. And [now] I am despatching Rabi-ilu; [my messenger ?] will convey to him . . . these words."'

Professor Rogers has enriched his book with well-chosen photographs, and has added to it a useful index. It is admirably printed: I have been able to discover only two misprints, '756' for 576 on p. 101, and שביר for שניר on p. 303.

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

By the Rev. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., Principal of New College, London.

V.

(1) It may appear a rashness even to madness, if in closing I venture to suggest a few considerations towards a better metaphysic. (i.) We must start with the historical fact, as literary and historical criticism to-day shows that fact to be. What is doubtful must not be determinative of our Christology; but our construction must rest on the certain. I have already indicated what will fall out of our view, and what must be brought into it. The historical reality of the moral character, the religious consciousness and the mediatorial function of Christ is the datum to be dealt with. (ii.) These historical facts must be interpreted primarily in the interests of personal faith. We must not ignore the fact that the motive of the Ancient Creeds was religious. Athanasius' conception of the Christian salvation necessitated the assertion of the ὁμοούσιον. But it is to be feared that in subsequent controversies, not only did lower worldly motives enter, but even where these were absent, a merely intellectual interest in definition of Christian truth asserted itself. While we need not go as far as Ritschl and his school in limiting Christian doctrine to what faith can immediately apprehend—and many recognize that faith includes an exercise of the intellect in appropriating divine truth, in making its own in distinct, consistent thinking the meaning of all its objects—yet not a speculative curiosity must guide our inquiries, but a personal moral and religious necessity to know God in Christ so as to trust fully, love freely, and serve faithfully. (iii.) For the interpretation of the historical facts in the interests of personal faith we are to-day not worse but better equipped with the metaphysical formulæ. It would be strange, indeed, if the twentieth Christian century were in this respect at a disadvantage in comparison with the fourth and fifth. Modern philosophy has a closer affinity to, because it stands in a greater dependence on, Christian truth than did ancient philosophy.

(2) We must first of all in attempting any re-

statement of doctrine get rid of the term substance from our doctrine of God and Christ alike, for its associations are physical and even material; we must substitute subject, spirit, or best of all person or personality. The two terms are now used interchangeably; but it would be well if we could distinguish them: *Personality* as the abstract noun connoting the qualities which belong to the person, and *Person* as the concrete noun denoting the individual existence to which these qualities belong, corresponding to the difference between manhood and man. Much would be gained for clearness of thought if we could get rid of the use of the term *person* to express the distinction of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as it is now quite misleading, and tends towards tritheism; the terms mode, principle, or subsistence are too abstract and impersonal. I have not been able to discover a term that is satisfactory. So long as we use the word person of the Trinity, we cannot speak as I wish we could, of the one person of the Godhead as of the one person of Christ. Probably we must be content with the ambiguity of the term person as applied to the trinity in God and the unity of Christ, and try to avoid even the appearance of any modalism by speaking of the personality of God, when we want to assert the divine unity. That we should speak of the personality of God seems to me of urgent importance, as God in popular thinking is conceived of as a society.

(3) We may continue speaking of the two *natures* in Christ, so long as we keep clearly before ourselves that *nature* does not mean *substance*, but as an abstract noun connotes the qualities which belong respectively to God and man, that is divinity or Godhood, and humanity or manhood, and also so long as we recognize that in the realm of the spirit, in mind, heart, will, there is such affinity, and not contradiction between Godhood and manhood, that one person can be God and man without any duality of consciousness or activity, but in a perfect mental, moral, and religious unity. Nothing more helpful to Christology has modern philosophy offered to us than Lotze's discussion of personality in God and man. Man's personality is imperfect, and God's alone perfect. The divine in Christ does not suppress but completes the human. Human receptivity of faith and divine communicativeness of grace are perfect personal unity in Him. It was because Christian thought had not reached this stage of enlightenment and insight, that Apollinaris was adjudged a heretic, and he himself falsely expressed a truth. The Logos need not displace the rational soul that Christ may be one.

(4) There are two other modern conceptions, the significance and value of which for Christology have not yet been adequately recognized, *immanence* and *evolution*. It has been already stated that the view of the creeds is *static*, and it has been implied, if not affirmed, that it is *deistic*, and *deistic* because *static*. If God be unchangeable, impassible in the sense of the creeds, He must necessarily be separated from the world and man. (i.) The divine immanence presupposes that in His activity in the world God must so limit Himself that the cosmic process and the human progress in time and space are real for Him, that He so far participates in change and suffering. Creation implies self-limitation of God (Kenosis); the immanence of the Creator in the Creation involves this still further. If we follow out this thought, does it not help us to conceive how God was really in Christ in human conditions? (ii.) The conception of evolution enables us to think of that divine immanence as progressive, not in the sense that God is more present in the end than in the beginning; but that in the progress of nature and man God becomes ever more manifest, and His Creation in becoming self-conscious becomes more conscious of Him. We can apply this conception of a progressive immanence most fruitfully to Christ. He in His person is the consummation of this process in nature and man; and in His personal development the consummation is gradually realized. As the manhood grows, so God is more fully in Him, until His glorified manhood becomes the perfect organ of the glory of God.

Literature.

GEZER.

Those who possess a set of the 'Survey of Western Palestine' will at once purchase the three uniformly bound volumes on *The Excavation of Gezer*, which have been written by Professor R. A. Stewart Macalister, M.A., F.S.A., and published by Mr. Murray (£4, 4s. net). Those who do not possess that set may be encouraged to begin their collecting with the Gezer volumes. For Professor Macalister can write as cleverly as he can excavate. With all their scientific value a certain literary grace is the first and most arresting feature of these volumes. And this literary excellence is so unmistakable as well as so attractive that the volumes may be recommended even to those who are yet young enough to be beginning their acquaintance with the exploration of the Holy Land.

Throughout the first two volumes, which contain the letterpress, are scattered a large number of illustrations and plans. The third volume is occupied entirely with plate illustrations and the index to them. It is evident at the first glance that no expense has been spared to make the book worthy of the subject and its author's reputation. Few handsomer volumes have ever been published even about Palestine—that land of great books as well as great deeds.

The story of the excavation of Gezer is the history of Palestine. Professor Macalister has had at his command the vast literature of the subject, and he has used it to make the history complete. But, to tell the truth, there was nearly enough of material at Gezer itself to enable him to write the history of the country. And yet it is a history which extends from pre-Semitic times (that is to say, from before the year 2500 B.C.) to the present day. Indeed, the most striking of all the results obtained were those which carried the existence and occupation of the town back into the Canaanite times. And here it is just as well to point out that the knowledge of these pre-Semitic Canaanites and of their customs, which the excavation of Gezer has brought us, is necessary to an understanding of many of the institutions of the Old Testament. What a flood of light is cast on the redemption of the first-born by the discovery that the Canaanite inhabitants were regularly accustomed to dedicate to God their first-born by death. There are inferences in the papers which Dr. Macalister published in the *Quarterly Statement* which he has had to correct in these volumes, but the proof of infant sacrifice remains undiminished. Here are the words Professor Macalister uses:

'That the Canaanite inhabitants of Gezer sacrificed their infant children at the High Place is proved by the cemetery of jar-buried infants found under the earth all over the area. The sacrosanct nature of the first-born is a principle so deeply rooted in the Semitic mind, that in the earliest Pentateuchal legislation the sacrifice of the first-born of man was anticipated and evaded by substitution of some lawful animal. The same evasion was adopted in the case of a domestic animal (such as an ass), which it was not permitted to sacrifice.

'That these sacrificed infants were the first-born, devoted in the Temple, is indicated by the fact that none were over a week old. This seems to show that the sacrifices were not offered under stress of any special calamity, or at the rites attaching to any special season of the year. The special circumstance which led to the selection of these infants must have been something inherent in the victims themselves, which devoted them to sacrifice from the moment of their birth. Among various races various circumstances are regarded as sufficient reasons for infanticide—deformity, the birth of twins, etc.; but among the Semites the one cause most likely to have been effective was primogeniture. The smaller vessels buried with the infants were probably food-vessels with a viaticum for the victim.'

What method has Professor Macalister adopted? He tells us that two alternative methods offered themselves, between which he found it difficult to choose. At first he thought of dividing the remains in epochs and culture levels, and so giving a bird's-eye view of the city's life at each successive stage of its history. He even made some progress with that plan. But he found that it would involve much repetition; and even if he could offer a complete account of the city life at any stage, which was doubtful, he could do so only by cutting up his objects, such as the pottery,

into isolated parts. He therefore abandoned the culture-stage method and resolved to describe his results in groups. After the opening chapters are past we come to the 'Dwellings and Defences,' 'The Burial of the Dead,' 'Food and Dress,' 'Work and Play,' 'Foreign Trade and Foreign Conquerors,' 'Warfare,' 'Religion, Folklore, and Superstition'—each subject or group of subjects occupying a long chapter, and within that chapter being fully and finally described.

The last chapter is occupied with 'Religion, Folklore, and Superstition,' and it is no doubt the chapter of most interest in the book. But every chapter has to do with religion or folklore or superstition, and that not because the book is on Palestine, but because the daily life of the people at the stage of culture chiefly described here is penetrated by religious feeling. No such separation as that between sacred and secular is conceivable. It follows that when we read even the seventh chapter on 'Work and Play' we find illustrations on every page of that primitive conception which at last, purified and lifted up, gave to Israel the practical thought of a people wholly devoted to God. It is true that Israel never realized that great thought, simply through persisting in working at it from the circumference. But it is the very thought which was realized in Christ, who by working from within 'made all meats clean.'

Many a gruesome discovery did Mr. Macalister make at Gezer, but none surpassed the discovery of innumerable new-born infants. That the most of them were simply sacrificed, we have already seen, and we wonder that their parents could have done it. And so here again we come to Christ. The most unchristian modern woman would shudder at the thought. Why? Because Christ has taken the natural affections also into the service of God—or to be yet more conclusive, because Jesus said, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me.' The deposits of infants were found not in the Canaanite period only, but also in all the Semitic strata close up to the time of Christ.

But we must not spend space in improving the occasion. There is enough in these volumes for those who desire only entertainment. There is also scientific worth for the student of almost all the sciences.

THE PRAYER BOOK DICTIONARY.

We are heartily glad to be able to commend without reserve *The Prayer Book Dictionary* (Pitman; 25s. net). The editors are both Canons of Liverpool, the Rev. George Harford, M.A., being also vicar of Mossley Hill, and the Rev. Morley Stevenson, M.A., being also Principal of Warrington Training College. The Bishop of Liverpool, who writes the preface, notices with satisfaction that no fewer than twenty-three of the contributors are clergymen or laymen in the Diocese of Liverpool. This may seem at first sight to be a weakness, suggesting want of knowledge of the scholars of the Church of England generally on the part of the editors, and even one-sidedness in the theology of the book. But we are glad to say that that suspicion in both parts is removed by the study of the articles as a whole, and the Bishop is entitled to his satisfaction.

It is inevitable that the articles should be some more and some less satisfactory. One of the less satisfactory is the article on Divorce. It is too short for so living a subject, a subject on which so many perplexed persons are sure to consult the Dictionary. One of the most satisfactory articles is Dr. Driver's article on the Psalter. This article is kept within the proper limits of a Dictionary of the Prayer Book, but at the same time every sentence it contains is of universal interest and value. The last section, though thrown into small type, is the most useful of all. It is a discussion of the Imprecatory Psalms. We shall serve our present purpose best by quoting it in full.

'Only the so-called *Imprecatory Psalms* seem to form an exception to what has been said above on the high spiritual value of the Psalter, and its ready adaptability to give direction and expression to the devotional feelings of Christian men. The imprecations in the Psalms (principally 35^{4-8} 59^{11-13} 69^{23-29} 109^{5-19}; cp. also 58^{9} 137^{9}) strike a discordant note in a book which breathes in general a spirit of saintly resignation. In the case of Ps 109, it has been supposed that vv.$^{5-19}$ are not the curses of the Psalmist himself, but those of his *enemies*, which he quotes (so that 'saying' should be understood at the end of v.^{4}). It is doubtful if this view is correct (notice v.^{19}); but, even if it were, the principle would not account for the other imprecations in the Psalms, or for the hardly less strong ones expressed by Jeremiah (11^{20} 17^{18}

18^{21-23}; cp. also the glow of *national* vengeance which animates Is 34, Jer 50^{2}–51^{58}). Such utterances may be palliated; but it is idle to pretend that they breathe the spirit of Christ, or that they can be appropriated consistently by His followers. They may be palliated in part by the consideration that the Psalmists, like the prophets, were keenly sensible of the great conflict going on between good and evil, between God and His enemies, both as between Israel and heathen nations, and as between the godly and the ungodly in Israel itself; they felt that the cause really at stake was the very existence of all Divine truth and righteousness upon earth: in desiring, therefore, the downfall of their ungodly enemies, they were but desiring the overthrow of evil in the world, and the triumph of righteousness and the cause of truth. Even, however, when full allowance has been made for such considerations, there remains a *personal* element, an element of personal feeling and vindictiveness, which cannot be eliminated. The foes of the Psalmist or of Jeremiah may have been hostile to a cause; but they also attacked and persecuted a *person*; and it is the personal feeling thus aroused which finds expression in these imprecations, and which also, judged by the standard of Christian ethics, stands condemned. We must admit it; and can only see in it the voice of persecuted righteousness, not yet freed from discordant notes by the precept and example of Christ. The O.T. contains the record of a *progressive* revelation: the education of the chosen nation was gradual: there is a human element in the Biblical writers, which inspiration elevates and illumines, but does not suppress; it ought not therefore to surprise us if human feeling, which is so prominent in O.T. writers, and as a rule is so singularly pure and noble, should occasionally betray its earthly origin.'

THE GOLDEN BOUGH.

Of all the parts into which the third edition of 'The Golden Bough' is divided (and it is divided into seven parts, which will run to at least nine volumes) surely the most entertaining and surely also the most instructive is the fifth part, just published in two volumes, with the title *Spirits of the Corn and of the Wild* (Macmillan; 20s. net). And of its chapters surely the most entertaining and instructive is the eleventh on 'The Sacrifice of First-Fruits.'

First of all, what a flood of colour this chapter throws on the references to First-fruits in the Old Testament. Nothing, we used to think, could be simpler, more natural, easier to understand and to appreciate, than the offering of the first ripe sheaf of the harvest to God. But the *sacrifice* of the First-fruits? And so, in the second place, how utterly are all our simple natural ideas 'whistled down the wind' as we proceed with Dr. Frazer's merciless accumulation of examples to prove that all over the world the offering of the First-fruits is first a sacrifice to the gods or the spirits of the dead in order to avert calamity and ensure fertility, and then a sacrament, mystic, wonderful, between God and man.

'In Florida, one of the Solomon Islands, the canarium nut is much used in the native cookery, but formerly none might be eaten till the sacrifice of the first-fruits had been offered to the ghosts of the dead. This was done on behalf of a whole village by a man who inherited a knowledge of the way in which the sacrifice should be offered, and who accordingly had authority to open the season. When he saw that the time had come, he raised a shout early in the morning, then climbed a tree, cracked the nuts, ate some himself, and put some on the stones in his sacred place for the particular ghost whom he worshipped. Then all the people might gather the nuts for themselves. The chief offered food, in which the new nuts were mixed, on the stones of the village sanctuary; and every man who revered a ghost of his own did the same in his private sanctuary.'

That is a solitary example. Dr. Frazer overwhelms us with the like. And his examples are indisputable. Of that he takes very good care. For no man ever had a swifter sense of verification. He is the widest reader of missionary literature in the world, and he accepts or rejects with unerring decision.

ACROSS AUSTRALIA.

Along with the late Dr. A. W. Howitt the best modern authorities on the Australian aborigines are Professor Baldwin Spencer and Mr. F. J. Gillen. 'Spencer and Gillen' (they work and write together) is one of the surest abbreviations in the literature of primitive religion and folklore. Their new book is as scientific as ever, but it is more popular. Whereas they were formerly known

to hundreds, this book will introduce them to thousands. And its production is in keeping with its popularity. In addition to a very large number of illustrations in black and white, there are seven coloured plates, and most exquisitely coloured they are, the very highest reach yet attained of colour printing.

The book is the record of a journey across Australia, as its title tells us—*Across Australia* (Macmillan; 2 vols. 21s. net). Now the crossing of Australia, still a sufficiently arduous task, is easier than it used to be. In the year 1866 Sir Thomas Elder, to whose enterprise South Australia owes so much, introduced camels into the country, and from that time the explorer of Central Australia has been largely independent of water supply. For not only will the camel carry water for the use of the human members of the party, but it will itself do without any for long periods. All the same, the introduction of the camel has not been an unmixed blessing. Messrs. Spencer and Gillen give us a graphic account of the difficulty of mounting and the equal difficulty of dismounting, and of the disconcerting experiences that are apt to occur between these two delicate operations.

Not long after their journey began, our explorers came upon some members of the Urabunna tribe, and 'while we were with them, the leading rain-man performed a ceremony, and, within two days of the performance, there was a downpour—possibly associated with the fact that it was the usual time of the year for rains to fall in that part of the country. Whether this was so or not, at all events the reputation of the rain-maker as a magic man of no mean order was firmly established. We had been camping out in the open, but were fortunately sheltered under the hospitable roof of our friend Mr. Kempe before the efforts of the rain-maker were crowned with success. When we saw him he was brimming over with undisguised, but at the same time dignified self-satisfaction.'

If they could have carried a successful rain-man with them they could have travelled with horses. But they do not seem to have had faith enough. The day is coming, however, as they hope, when a more scientific method of dealing with the clouds will bring rain periodically and plentifully.

They studied the religious beliefs of the people wherever they went. They tell us that in this Urabunna tribe every child that is born is supposed to 'be a spirit child come to life again. The child grows, and when, in the course of events, it dies, either young or old, its spirit part returns to its old home, only to remain there until such time as it is once more born in human form. These Urabunna people have also evolved the very comforting and fair belief that, if you are a man in one life, you will be a woman in the next, and so on *ad infinitum*.' This may be a useful belief to persuade the men to do justly and love mercy when the question of the political representation of women becomes acute in that tribe.

One thing that the book compels us to reconsider is the common opinion of the very low mental state of the aborigines. If they are so utterly incapable of mentality, how are they so clever at catching animals? Watch them tracking an emu to its nest, or catching it in the open. Speaking of the desert region of Lake Amadeus, our authors say: 'In this part of the country the leaves are pounded up in water, and the decoction thus made is placed in a wooden vessel out in the scrub where an emu is likely to come across it; or, more often, it is put into a water pool which is frequented by the bird. After drinking the Pitcheri water the bird is said to become stupefied; or, to use the expressive description given to us by a native who was describing its action, the bird becomes "drunk, all same white man," and then falls an easy prey to the blackfellow's spear.'

The value of the book is the greater that in this journey the travellers sometimes came upon tribes which were utterly unacquainted with white men. Of one such tribe they say: 'They had never seen either a white man or a horse before, and when we dismounted and the beast came in two, they were terrified and could do nothing but huddle together on the ground, weeping with fear.' But they discovered no tribe so useful to them as that Arunta tribe from which they had already derived so much anthropological and religious lore. And much of the second volume is occupied with a description of Arunta ceremonies.

SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE BIBLE.

Under the title of *Sociological Study of the Bible* a book has been written by Mr. Louis Wallis, formerly Instructor in Economics and Sociology in the Ohio State University, and published at the

Cambridge University Press as agents for the University of Chicago Press (6s. net).

In the hands of Mr. Wallis, sociological study does not mean the study of society as opposed to the individual. His study of the Bible begins with the origin of the Bible itself, passes to a sketch of Hebrew kinships, and then proceeds to describe the religious institutions of Israel, covering discussions of subjects like Urim and Thummim. Thus, so long as the volume is occupied with the Old Testament there is no contrast whatever in the word sociological, as there could not well be, since the religion and indeed the life of the Old Testament is tribal or national. Thus far, therefore, it is simply a record of the life of ancient Israel that Mr. Wallis offers us. That record is competently and successfully condensed.

But when he passes to the Work of Jesus, he cannot ignore the presence of the individual. Yet he ignores the individual still as much as possible. For his purpose is not to draw out the contrast between Christ's own way with individuals and His prophecy of the Kingdom, but to show how the establishment of the Kingdom came naturally and inevitably out of the teaching of the Master and the choice of the Twelve. He therefore says that while Christianity is primarily personal, being not a doctrine but a *life*, sociology has to do with it only as it links the history of Israel to the history of the world.

JOHN HUNGERFORD POLLEN.

Mr. John Hungerford Pollen is remembered as the architect of Newman's University Church in Dublin. 'In November 1854,' says Newman (Ward's *Life*, i. 347), 'I got acquainted with Mr. Pollen, Professor (honorary) of the Fine Arts, and I employed him as my architect, or rather decorator, for my idea was to build a large barn, and decorate it in the style of a Basilica, with Irish marbles and copies of standard pictures. I set about the building at once, and it was solemnly opened on May 1st, 1856.'

Newman and Pollen had not met before, but Pollen had been a follower for a long time. He had gone up to Oxford from Eton on the eve of the issue of Tract 90, and had at once reckoned himself among the Tractarians. When Newman 'went over' he was too young to follow, but the reading of the 'Development of Doctrine' had its effect. For a time, however, Pusey was the idol, and Pollen was greatly attracted by the Confessional and the movement towards greater fulness of ritual. He gave his aid to the work at St. Saviour's, Leeds, and by his courtesy won the affection of Hook, although in reality as 'high' as the highest attached to that very ritualistic and distracting Church.

And now the interest of the biography becomes rather keen. We know that Pollen did finally 'go over'; but he stood fast while the rest of the St. Saviour's men went, and we watch the struggle, seeing how much it is to cost this layman to sever himself from the Church of his fathers. He fled to France when the step became at last inevitable, and was 'received' by the Archbishop of Rouen. It was soon thereafter that he was offered the Professorship of Fine Art in the new University in Dublin, of which Newman was Rector, and 'decorated' the University Church.

Till then his life had been spent in Oxford. He had reached the dignity of Senior Proctor, and much popularity. 'But he was not a man to be trifled with. A fine was presented in sixpences and halfpence to the Senior Proctor by an undergraduate. They were politely declined, and he was bidden to bring the same sum next day in fourpenny pieces. These he was desired to translate into pennies, and subsequently into shillings; so that he found leisure, before his fine was accepted, to regret an ill-timed pleasantry;—or, perhaps, to digest a first lesson in manners.'

He must now leave Oxford, however. For 'walking one day in the streets of Rome, he saw for the first time, seated at a window, and unconscious of observation, a lady nearly fifteen years of age.' She was the daughter of the Rev. Charles John La Primaudaye, so often mentioned in the biography of Cardinal Manning. Mr. Pollen married Maria La Primaudaye, having waited till she reached the age of sixteen. He himself was five-and-thirty. And having married he had to look out for some career out of Oxford. The first offer was Newman's professorship, and he accepted it. Thereafter art and devotion (not merely devotional art) occupied him.

It is a clever biography. His daughter, who writes it, may safely give herself to biographical writing. But in future she must consider the outsider and uninitiated more. What should we have done with this book if we had not had Newman and Manning fresh in the memory? Its title

is *John Hungerford Pollen*, 1820–1902 (John Murray; 15s. net). The book is greatly enriched with photographs and reproductions of Mr. Pollen's artistic work.

The number of *Anthropos* for May–June 1912 contains three articles in French, four in German, one article in Italian, and one in Spanish. There are no English articles. But this is quite exceptional, and certainly does not signify that the study of man is insufficiently cultivated in English-speaking countries. Among the 'Analecta et Additamenta' there is a note by Mr. H. A. Junod on 'Sexual Rites of Purification amongst the Thonga of Lourenço Marques'; and in the 'Bibliographie' there is a notice of Dr. Haddon's little book on the History of Anthropology. One of the most useful features of this magnificent magazine is the transcription at the end of the contents of all the anthropological periodicals in the world. The accuracy of this 'Zeitschriftenschau' as it is called in German, and 'Revue des Revues' as it is called in French, is beyond praise.

From the Cambridge University Press there comes *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis*, by Mr. John S. McIntosh. It is a Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature in the University of Chicago in candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (3s. net).

A deputation recently called upon the Archbishop of Canterbury and suggested that he should put himself at the head of a movement for the production of a new translation of the Bible. The Archbishop was cautious. He doubted if the time had come. He suggested that a small portion might be translated first, and named the Epistle to the Hebrews. Two Cambridge men accepted the suggestion and translated that Epistle. The result is a thin handsome volume with the title of *The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Experiment in Conservative Revision*, by two Clerks (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2s. 6d. net).

The two Clerks do not call it a new translation. They call it a revision. In a word, the Authorized Version is used and left unaltered except where scholarship says it is wrong or misleading. The complaint of the deputation to the Archbishop was that the Revised Version had departed too freely from the Authorized: this version departs as rarely as possible.

It will not please everybody. The two Clerks did not hope for that. We doubt if it will please anybody. We doubt if it pleases themselves. For there is nothing easier than revising, until it is tried: then it is found to be almost insuperably difficult. Who will approve of 'which' being left for 'who,' as in 'we which have believed?' Is not that too conservative? But who will say that the translation of 2^{16} is conservative enough?—'For verily he taketh not angels for his, but he taketh the seed of Abraham.' There are marginal readings, and in this verse for 'he taketh' the alternative 'doth he aid' is suggested.

But it is only an experiment. And every honest and scholarly attempt will bring nearer the much-desired end.

Nineteen years ago Dr. R. H. Charles published an edition in English of *The Book of Enoch*. Eight years ago he published the Ethiopic text, together with the Greek and Latin fragments. The two books were seen at once to be out of touch. The English edition had been made from Dillmann's text somewhat emended. But Dr. Charles had made discoveries. He had discovered, among other things, that a considerable part of the book is in the form of poetry. This enabled him to recover the lost original with an assurance previously impossible. This text was therefore a new text. And now at last he has given us a translation of this new text with all the former apparatus of introduction, notes, and indexes (Clarendon Press; 10s. 6d. net).

One thing is worth noticing. When the first English edition was issued, Dr. Charles said, in a sentence, 'A knowledge of I Enoch is indispensable to New Testament students.' In the second edition he makes that statement at greater length. But it is no longer necessary. Schweitzer and others have given the study of all this literature such an impetus that the study of Apocrypha and Apocalyptic is like to supersede the study of the New Testament itself. Dr. Charles will see this by the rapid sale of his new edition, and he will no doubt be satisfied.

Mr. Henry Frowde has published for the Yale University Press a volume entitled *The Christian*

View of the World, being the Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures for 1910–1911, delivered before the Divinity School of Yale University (8s. 6d. net). The author is George John Blewett, Ryerson Professor of Moral Philosophy in Victoria College, Toronto.

The title of the book is almost identical with that of Professor James Orr's Kerr Lectures. The handling of the subject is quite different. Professor Blewett has only four lectures, each of which would have occupied two hours in delivering if he had read every word; and every lecture is packed with thought, much of which is new and demands the closest attention. The newness of the thought is partly due to its setting. Old enough are some of the conceptions (even the conception of nature as the reality of a relation between man and God), but they are given under new conditions, with a new theory of experience and a new outlook. The titles of the lectures are: (1) 'The Christian Consciousness and the Task of Theology'; (2) 'Human Experience and the Absolute Spirit'; (3) 'Nature'; (4) 'Freedom, Sin, and Redemption.' Perhaps we might make bold to express the fundamental thought of the whole book in this way: There is no dualism in the universe; sin is an entrance, but it is provided for in creation, which is itself incomplete until it ends in redemption.

It takes one some time to get into the swing of Professor Blewett's style. Once in, one is carried to the end, but with all one's faculties awake, as if for rough ground ahead at any turn of the road.

An excellent example, vivid, conservative, and competent, of the lecture on the Old Testament which it will fall to the lot of many a scholar to deliver in the coming years, has been delivered by Thomas Franklin Day, Professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature in San Francisco Theological Seminary. He has published it under the title of *The New Bible-Country* (New York: Crowell; 30 cents).

Three addresses by Professor Boutroux have been translated and published under the title of the first of the three—*The Beyond that is Within* (Duckworth; 3s. 6d. net). The other two lectures are on 'Morality and Religion,' and 'The Relation of Philosophy to the Sciences.'

The idea of the first lecture, with its curious title, is that there is no need to go to Spiritualism or even to the Bible for proof of a life beyond the present, that life being discoverable in our own consciousness. 'Do you remember,' asks Professor Boutroux, 'those magnificent words of Goethe: "Alas! alas! Thou hast shattered, with thy destroying hand, the splendid heaven which illuminated, protected, and vivified our world. It crumbles, it falls asunder. We cast its ruins into the inane, and mourn over the beauty that has vanished. Mighty son of earth, take courage; the outer beyond has dissolved, but build a yet more glorious beyond, build it in thine own bosom!"' Accordingly, if he had been preaching instead of lecturing, Professor Boutroux would have preached, he says, from the text, 'The kingdom of God is within you.'

The Early Jewish Christian Church is the title which the Rev. J. Ironside Still, M.A., has given to his Bible-class primer on the first twelve chapters of the Book of Acts (Edinburgh: United Free Church Offices; 6d. net). A Bible-class primer is for use not ornament, and Mr. Still has not forgotten that, with all his joy in certain discoveries which he believes he has made in the earliest history of the Church. These discoveries—the most outstanding is that there were two parties in the Jerusalem Church, a Stephen party and a James party, and that the latter party was in no danger of stoning—these discoveries, we say, make the life of the book. And they will do no harm in the hands of a judicious teacher, especially as they are for the most part reserved (by brackets) for the advanced student. The book is alive from cover to cover.

It is discouraging to the ambitious young man to read the lives of the great of the earth and find how many of them had marvellous memories. Let him take courage. There are ways of assisting nature. One of the ways of obtaining a substitute for a good natural memory will be found fully described in Professor A. Loisette's *Assimilative Memory* (Funk & Wagnalls; 10s. 6d. net). It is an elaborate system and inevitably raises the question whether the time spent on mastering it might not be better spent in ordinary repetition. But it *is* a system and a scientific one; and very soon one finds order emerge from apparent chaos. The single secret is *attention*. 'You remember,'

says Professor Loisette, 'what you fix your attention upon.' His method is to train the attention by various clever devices of association and succession.

The Rhind Lectures for 1891 were delivered by John Beddoe, M.D., LL.D., F.R.S., their subject being *The Anthropological History of Europe*. In these twenty years and one much has been done in Anthropology, as much perhaps as in any science with the evident exception of Religion. It was necessary, therefore, that the second edition of the book containing the lectures should greatly differ from the first. Dr. Beddoe has been able to revise his book for the new edition, he has been able to revise it thoroughly. It is a new book, the best sketch now obtainable of the history of European man (Paisley: Alexander Gardner; 6s. net).

There are great possibilities in 'special occasions,' but it requires special grace on the part of the preacher to use them. How often is the 'special' sermon empty and tawdry. Two things seem to be essential to the successful special preacher—self-oblivion and a gospel. Then he will preach such sermons as those *Sermons on Special Occasions* which were preached in the Thomas Coats Memorial Church in Paisley by the Rev. Walter A. Mursell (Gardner; 2s. 6d. net).

We have received four new parts of *The Churchman's Pulpit*, edited by the Rev. J. Henry Burn, B.D. (Griffiths; 1s. 6d. net each). Also four new parts of *The Children's Pulpit* (1s. net each) and a double part, containing 'Nature Talks to the Young' (2s. 6d. net). To the same publishers' Lecture Library are added two numbers, *The English Prayer Book*, by J. Lee Osborn (1s. 6d. net), and *Crusades and Crusaders*, by Percy Allen (1s. 6d. net). Each of these Lecture numbers contains 64 large octavo and very closely printed pages.

It has been our good fortune to be able to commend many of the Hartley Lectures as they have come to us annually from the Primitive Methodist Publishing House. Let us commend the Fourteenth Hartley Lecture beyond all the rest. Its subject is Preaching—for the first time in the history of the lectureship; and on that much-discussed subject Mr. J. Dodd Jackson has had the skill to seize and the courage to say just those things which are now most necessary. His very titles are assuring. Under 'The Man,' the subject of his first book, he discusses 'The Designation of the Preacher,' 'Things to be Realized,' 'The Need for Certainty,' 'Individuality,' 'Understanding,' and 'Passion.'

What does he mean by 'Understanding'? He quotes the ancient text, 'And the preacher had understanding.' This, he tells us, is only another way of saying that he must know what he is talking about. 'So much as this, at least, is essential in every man who comes forth to teach others.' It is one of the essential things, undoubtedly; perhaps as essential for the preacher in our day as anything. The demand on the preacher to know is almost unattainable, so wide as well as thorough has his knowledge to be. But there is no discharge. 'It was a wise word of Dr. Adam Clarke, "Study yourself to death, and then pray yourself to life."' On which Mr. Jackson's own commentary is: 'Preaching must be life. Preaching can only be life when the preacher has understanding.'

In all ways the book is itself life. The title is *The Message and the Man* (Hammond; 2s. 6d.).

The Rev. John Blacket has revised his *History of South Australia*, enlarged it and brought it down to a recent date (Adelaide: Hussey & Gillingham). To the new edition (it is the second) a preface has been contributed by the Right Hon. Sir Samuel J. Way, Bart.

Dr. Joseph Agar Beet has revised and enlarged his Introduction to the New Testament. Its complete title is *The New Testament: Its Authorship, Date, and Worth* (Kelly; 1s. 6d. net).

Of the series of cheap reprints, which are many, one of the cheapest and best is called 'The Finsbury Library.' It contains among other things Flew's *Studies in Browning*. It contains also autobiographies of early Methodists, under the title of *Wesley's Veterans*, edited by the Rev. John Telford, B.A. (Kelly; 3 vols., 1s. net each).

By a curious coincidence both the Hartley and the Fernley Lecturers for the year have taken Preaching for their subject. The Fernley Lecturer is Professor George Jackson. His Lecture is

touched upon in another place. Its title is *The Preacher and the Modern Mind* (Kelly; 3s. 6d.).

By choosing the title *Beaten Gold* (Kelly; 3s. 6d.) for his sermons on certain texts taken from the poets, Dr. R. P. Downes does not make an extravagant claim for himself. He might call his sermons by such a title, for he has good thoughts well expressed. But the title applies to the texts. As an example of the texts, take that of the sermon on Happiness—the author is unknown—

> The happiest heart that ever beat
> Was in some quiet breast,
> That found the common daylight sweet,
> And left to heaven the rest.

Mr. Gregory A. Page was afraid to give his book the title of 'The Gospel according to Judas,' so he makes that its sub-title, and for title he chooses *The Diary of Judas Iscariot* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net). It is a clever conception to make Judas write a diary of events and publish it, but it is not a clever book. Mr. Page has no great gift of imagination; perhaps his imagination is paralyzed by the intimate knowledge he possesses of the Gospels. Judas reasons at last like the Unjust Steward. He will make friends of the priests, that when all is over with Jesus they may confer some honour upon him.

Dr. W. T. Whitley has edited for the Baptist Historical Society *The Church Books of Ford or Cuddington and Amersham in the County of Bucks* (Kingsgate Press). The worth of the volume is either inappreciable or inestimable, according to a man's place and interests. The editing is beyond praise.

We made a mistake, it seems, when we said that Dr. Adrian Fortescue's *The Mass* was the first volume of a series of manuals for Catholic Priests and Students, to be called 'The Westminster Library,' and to be edited by Mgr. Bernard Ward and the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J. It is not the first volume; it is the fifth. The fault was partly the publishers', in not sending the earlier volumes for review. They thought, no doubt, that 'non-Catholics' would not be interested in Catholic books. But that is a mistake. The two volumes of the four previously published, which they have now sent—*The Tradition of Scripture*, by the Very Rev. William Barry, D.D.; and *Non-Catholic Denominations*, by the Very Rev. Mgr. R. H. Benson (Longmans; each 3s. 6d. net)—make an appeal as wide as the whole width of scholarship. Dr. Barry's method is a little unfamiliar, especially in the assertion of things which none of us would dream now of denying. And Mgr. Benson's point of view is that of the other person who sees us as we cannot possibly see ourselves. But the very unfamiliarity and the frankness are elements of value. And assuredly there is no sign of the superior person in either volume, no assumption that we are the people and wisdom will die with us. In Mgr. Benson's book one notices a tendency to exalt the individual at the expense of the denomination, as Spurgeon among the Baptists. And the question is never faced, How did Spurgeon arrive among the Baptists, or Dale among the Congregationalists?

The success of Mgr. Duchesne's *Christian Worship* has made it certain that a translation of his *Early History of the Christian Church* will receive attention. The translation, being well done, has added to Mgr. Duchesne's reputation in our land. Whatever he writes now will be read with eagerness. For he has a surpassing gift of lucid eloquence. Emotional his writing is, but also always intellectual. The whole man is in it; and Mgr. Duchesne is man enough to make the impression of a strong personality. His attitude is orthodox yet unfettered, or seemingly so. He departs not seriously at any time from the great traditions, and yet he investigates every question for himself and comes to the conclusions of a scientific historian. But the chief charm of all his work is its intimacy. He is with us, one of us, a modern scholar writing for modern appetites.

The second volume of the History has just been published by Mr. Murray (9s. net). It begins with the accession of Diocletian, and ends with the final establishment of Christianity as the State religion after the death of Julian.

In *Poems and Sonnets* (Nutt; 1s. net) Mr. F. C. Goldsborough makes an attempt to add new forms to the English Sonnet. Let the future writers on that fascinating subject, the English sonnet, take note. We shall quote, however, a shorter poem than a sonnet.

THE MOVING SPIRIT.

Deep in the heart of every wave
There dwells the urge of boundless tides;
So in the breast of king and slave
The deathless gleam of God abides!

Professor Paul Deussen of Kiel is perhaps as well known in English-speaking countries as any of the great students of Indian literature. His *Upanishads*, translated by Professor Geden, has had a wide circulation. The way is therefore prepared for the English edition of the book, which he calls *The System of the Vedânta*. The translation has been made by Mr. Charles Johnston of the Bengal Civil Service, retired. The publishers are the Open Court Publishing Company of Chicago.

The word Vedânta has two meanings. Literally it means 'the end of the Veda,' and refers originally to those philosophico-theological treatises which appear as the closing chapters of the single Brahmanas of the Veda, which were afterwards called Upanishad, or 'secret doctrine.' An exposition of Vedânta in this sense is found in Deussen's *Upanishads* already referred to. Later, however, the name Vedânta, in the sense of 'Final aim of the Veda,' is applied to the theologico-philosophical system founded on the Upanishads, which may be called the 'Dogmatics of Brahmanism.' It is the exposition of that system that is found in this volume. In order to keep things historically apart, the exposition is based exclusively on Badarayana's Brahma-sûtras with Sankyara's commentary thereon. The translation makes easy reading and yet it is reliable. Mr. Johnston is himself a Vedantic scholar. He could not otherwise have reached any measure of success. He is evidently also a good proof-reader, for the printing has been done in Leipzig, and yet there is not even a capital letter where a capital letter should not be.

To your collection of Catechisms add *The Intermediate Catechism* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication). It has been prepared by a Committee, of which Professor David S. Schaff is Chairman; and it has been approved by the General Assembly in session at Louisville, Ky., 1912.

There is a larger literature on tithing than the uninitiated would believe. Under its ancient name may be brought the whole subject of giving. And Mr. Arthur V. Babbs, A.B., certainly does not confine himself to the Old Testament in *The Law of the Tithe* (Revell; 5s. net), but illustrates, explains, and enforces the Old Testament law from the New Testament, the history of the Church, and other sources. It is a well-written book, and it deals seriously with a serious subject. We need not expect that the problem of giving will be easier in the future than it has been in the past. But how easy it would be if everybody would be persuaded by Mr. Babb's earnest pleading and give

One-tenth of ripened grain,
One-tenth of tree and vine,
One-tenth of all the yield
From ten-tenths' rain or shine.

One-tenth of lowing herds
That browse on hill and plain,
One-tenth of bleating flocks
For ten-tenths' shine and rain.

One-tenth of all increase
From counting room and mart,
One-tenth that science yields,
One-tenth of every art.

It will take Mr. Buckland a long time to finish his Devotional Commentary, if he affords three volumes occasionally to one book of the Bible, as he does with Genesis, the Psalms, and Romans. Of the last-named the third volume is out (R. T. S.; 2s.). The editor, as already stated, is Dr. W. H. Griffith Thomas.

The first number of the 'Proceedings of Seekers in Council' (that is to say, of those who are in touch with the editor of *The Seeker*) is entitled *The Mystic, the Church, and the World* (Watkins; 6d.). The author is the Rev. G. W. Allen.

In issuing a second edition of his *Pagan Christs* (Watts; 6s. net) Mr. J. M. Robertson must feel that it is a more important book than when the first edition appeared. For not only is it part of a great popular movement, but it has itself contributed not a little to the popularity of that movement. Drews, whose name is at the moment most conspicuous in the attempt to deny the existence of Jesus, owes the greater part of his argument to

this and other books by Mr. Robertson. The fundamental notion in Mr. Robertson's mind is that Jesus is an ancient sun-god, otherwise called Joshua and Jason, and the picture in the Gospels is made up partly of Jewish and partly of pagan mythological materials; and that notion Mr. Drews has simply taken over. Unfortunately for himself he takes the ignorance of Mr. Robertson's books along with their knowledge and lays himself open, as Mr. Robertson himself has done, to charges of serious misapprehension and misstatement. To his reviewers Mr. Robertson replies in this edition, admitting some mistakes and denying others, but confessing at the very beginning that he has not been able to keep abreast of the literature on the subject. His most culpable blunder, however, is to write books in refutation of the Gospels before he has studied them.

Should a poet read other poets? It is an unanswered question. But without doubt a philosopher should read other philosophers. And Professor Emile Boutroux has studied his predecessors to some purpose. In a fine octavo volume, published by Messrs. Macmillan (8s. 6d. net), he offers us the results of his study, under the title of *Historic Studies in Philosophy*. It is a hazardous thing to do, and he knows it. Without the processes, he says, who will believe that you have given the subject research enough? Who will be able to enter into the atmosphere of your results? But he need not fear. A Frenchman must first be sincere, after that he can do anything he pleases, so transparent is his language as a vehicle of thought. Only sixty pages are given to Socrates, less than a hundred to Aristotle, a little over sixty to Boehme, only twenty to Descartes, less than eighty to Kant; and yet we see Kant, Descartes, Boehme, Aristotle, and Socrates as Professor Boutroux sees them. More than that, we are momentarily persuaded that we see them as they are.

It is very difficult to make a bad translation of a French author; Mr. Fred Rothwell, B.A., has made a supremely good translation of these lectures of Professor Boutroux. They give the impression of having been written in English.

The estimate of Boehme is the most refreshing. It is a rare enough thing to find a professional philosopher in utter sympathy with this religious enthusiast. Boehme's motive being, as he frankly says, the salvation of his soul, philosophers are instantly turned off: the motive is tainted; pure metaphysics knows no such interested motives. But Professor Boutroux is only the more drawn to the philosophy of Boehme because the man is in such dead earnest.

In November 1909 Messrs. Morgan & Scott published the first edition of Mrs. Amy Wilson-Carmichael's *Lotus Buds*. It was a quarto, with 50 photogravures. The edition was of 2000 copies, and there was an edition de luxe of 250 copies. In July 1912 they have published the second edition. It is an octavo, with 50 half-tone engravings (6s.). The edition consists of 5250 copies. This is good for a missionary book, but it is an exceptionally good missionary book. Its charm is partly children and partly India. Together they make a tale (told by this accomplished story-teller) that is altogether irresistible.

The Dualistic Element in the Thinking of St. Paul.

By the Rev. C. Anderson Scott, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Westminster College, Cambridge.

II.

The conclusions already reached (The Expository Times, August 1912, p. 488) find confirmation from a consideration of some of Paul's references to spiritual forces under other names besides that of Angels. It is plain that he regards them as antagonistic to the human cause. 'I am persuaded that . . . neither angels nor principalities nor powers shall be able to separate us from the love of God'; 'our conflict is not with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers (that

is, according to the understanding of his readers, with angelic beings of high rank), with world-rulers of this darkness, with spirit-forces of evil in heaven.' The modern equivalent of Paul's 'heaven' or the 'heavenlies' would be 'the unseen.' The 'principalities and powers' of the unseen are definitely ranged against man in his efforts after righteousness; they are identical with, or in league with, 'world-rulers' whose dominion is over the 'present age,' with hyper-physical forces whose abode is in one of 'the heavens.'

The use of the word rendered 'world-rulers,' κοσμοκρατόρες, connects this passage with another in 1 Co 2^{6-8}, where Paul declares that Christians have 'a wisdom which is not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world (or better, age) which are coming to nought'; that none of the rulers of this world (τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) know the Divine wisdom; for if they had known it, they 'would not have crucified the Lord of glory.' Who are these 'rulers of this world' (or, age)? The traditional interpretation, and the one still favoured by many students, finds a reference to human powers, to Jewish or Roman authorities, or to both together, who were responsible for the crucifixion of Christ.[1] On the other hand, Everling, following Klöpper, and followed by Dibelius, is probably right in rejecting this interpretation. It is not possible in any real sense to extend the legal responsibility for the crucifixion of Christ to any 'rulers of this world' beyond Annas, Caiaphas, and Pilate, and to them it is impossible to apply the present participle καταργούμενων in any satisfactory way. Certainly, Ellicott's explanation, 'gradual nullification of these powers brought about by the gospel,' is no satisfactory interpretation of the participle as applied to any rulers who could be said to have 'crucified the Lord of glory.' The better interpretation appears to be that first put forward by Origen, viz., that by 'rulers of this world' the Apostle means spiritual forces, or 'angels,' ἄρχοντες being the concrete equivalent of the commoner ἀρχαί. In the *Ascension of Isaiah* the angels are described as 'principes istius mundi.' Everling quotes also from Barnabas, ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας; and from Ignatius, καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἡ παρθενία Μαριας.[2] And while St. Paul's use of the phrase ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in reference to Satan leaves little doubt that he could call the angels οἱ ἄρχοντες τ. α. τ., the word καταργεῖσθαι is one which he specially affects in order to describe the ultimate fate of these hostile spirit-forces. It is the word used in 1 Co 15^{24} of the final triumph of Christ over such powers, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ π. ἐξουσίαν; in 1 Th 2^{8} of the destruction of Antichrist at the Parousia; in He 2^{14} of the destruction of 'him that hath the power of death'; and in 2 Ti 1^{10} of the destruction or abolition of death itself by Christ.[3] It is further quite consistent with St. Paul's general thinking to regard these hostile forces as being in process of subjection since they had been worsted by Christ at the Cross, and are destined to be completely overthrown at His triumphant return. By 'rulers of this world' we ought therefore probably to understand the unseen powers; and these Paul accuses of having crucified the Lord of glory, inasmuch as they 'controlled the ethical and religious attitude of the pre-Christian world.'

The same unseen powers are also brought into connexion with the Crucifixion in a striking but difficult passage in Colossians (2^{15}): ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδείγματισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ θριαμβεύσας αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ. The subject of the sentence is probably ὁ θεός. In the Cross, or, possibly, in Christ, God triumphed over the principalities and powers. The use of the personal pronoun αὐτούς provides a link between αἱ ἀρχαί and οἱ ἄρχοντες: the ἀρχαί are not mere abstractions, but concrete forces. And God has triumphed over the principalities and powers after having stripped them off from Christ; and that somehow in connexion with the Crucifixion. The idea at the back of this strange picture is that our Lord was engaged in a real struggle with real powers of evil, a struggle which culminated in the Cross, and there resulted in a glorious victory for Him.[4] He proved stronger than the strong power which held humanity in thraldom. What made this conflict and victory possible was the Incarnation: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο. He was 'made in the likeness' of sin's flesh, that is of flesh, which historically had come to be an appanage of sin. It was through this σάρξ, this physical nature, that He became open to temptation, exposed to the

[1] So Findlay in *E.G.T.*; Godet, and St. John Thackeray.
[2] Asc. Is. 10, 11; Bar. 18; Ignat. *ad Eph.* 19.
[3] Outside the N.T. the word is used in the same connexion; *e.g.* Test. Benj. 3.
[4] Cf. Lk 11^{21}, the strong man armed.

assaults of the devil, entangled in the hostility of principalities and powers. And when Paul speaks of God having stripped off from Him (or, possibly, of Christ having stripped off from Himself) the principalities and powers, he describes what he believes to have taken place at the Crucifixion, when the physical nature and the spiritual nature of Christ were parted in twain. The death whereby He laid aside the physical nature was in effect the stripping off of the hostile forces which had got their grip on Him, as it were, through the σὰρξ, the ἀρχαὶ καὶ ἐξουσίαι, who were also κοσμοκρατόρες τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.

When once this significance of Paul's language has been perceived, many phrases or turns of expression in the Epistles are found either to illustrate what has been said, or to become themselves clear. The most important of these is one which when rightly understood is probably the most comprehensive expression for the unseen powers,—στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. It occurs four times in the writings of the Apostle.[1] What is common to all these passages is that he takes for granted that a condition of submission or enslavement to these στοιχεῖα had been a condition common to both Jews and Gentiles. Bishop Lightfoot, after an exhaustive examination, decided that the choice of interpretations lay between 'physical elements' and 'rudimentary teaching,' and himself preferred the latter. But since the commentary of Lightfoot, we have had that of Klöpper, with its classical discussion of the question, in which after showing the inapplicability of either of these explanations to all the passages, even in the form given to one of them by Hilgenfeld, he raised the question, 'How would it be if we were here confronted by the fact that Gentiles as well as Jews, in the period before Christ, had been subjected to the dominion of subordinate divine beings?' In other words, he suggested that στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου stands for the elemental forces of nature conceived as beings in the spirit world. There is good authority for rendering στοιχεῖα by 'heavenly bodies,' and we need not go beyond the Old Testament itself for the association of angelic beings with the stars of heaven. 'In Job (38^7) the morning stars and the sons of God or angels stand in synonymous parallelism, and when in the time of the kings Jehovah is called the Lord of Hosts, what is meant is that the God of Israel is one who controls the hosts of heaven, angels and stars, to carry out His purposes.'[2]

From this point of view στοιχεῖα would be a suitable word to denote the same spirit-forces which Paul elsewhere describes as dominions, principalities, and powers. If the same spiritual forces were also instrumental in the giving of the Law, the fact that they were 'put out of action' at the Crucifixion would have its bearing on the continued validity of the Law.

And this interpretation falls in well with the context in all the four passages. Paul adjures the Galatians not to become again enslaved to these cosmic forces which, for all their fancied power, are but weak and poverty-stricken. He reminds the Colossians that their experience of redemption in Christ might be described as having died out from under the dominion of these forces,—inasmuch as they had died with Christ to the flesh, to sin and to the world. And thus these passages fall to be added to those which reflect a dualistic element in the Apostle's thinking. They indicate his recognition of certain independent or quasi-independent forces of a spiritual kind, active in the affairs of man, and generally hostile to man's true happiness and to God.

Can these forces be classified? The answer to that question must be strictly tentative and provisional. Looking closely at all the evidence, they do not appear to be entirely homogeneous for St. Paul, or all of the same rank and influence. In the lowest grade he would probably place evil spirits or δαιμόνια, whose dwelling-place was in the atmosphere. So far as idol-worship had any meaning at all, it was really offered to these demons: herein the Apostle would follow the criticism of idolatry by his Jewish forerunners. These demons were under the authority of the 'prince of the power of the air.' They and he were the authors of disease, misfortune, and mischief. Their prince, to whatever form of thought he owes his origin, has taken on some of the characteristics of the Satan of the Old Testament. He is the tempter, the evil one, the 'god of this age,' or world. To a higher grade as to a higher abode belong the angels who are not essentially evil, any more than they are essentially good. But by a process of which Paul suggests no explanation, the chief among them, described as 'princi-

[1] Gal $4^{3,9}$, Col $2^{8,20}$.

[2] Klöpper, *Com. on Col.* p. 879; cf. Ewald, *Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, ii. 294; Deissmann, *E.Bi.* col. 1261.

palities and powers,' have come to occupy an attitude of hostility to God and man. The world, so far as it is not Christian, is in bondage to them. The Law itself, like every other form of religious observance which leads men to trust in what they do, and not in what God is, has been an instrument of this bondage, and its abrogation is bound up with their defeat. But they are, if one may put it so, morally distinct from the prince of evil: he, with death and sin, is marked for destruction; they are included in the reconciling purpose of God.

In conclusion, what are we to say about this dualistic element in the Apostle's thinking? First, as to its character. Its source and its basis are religious and not philosophical. That is to say, it does not rise out of, or rest upon, any speculation regarding the origin of the world and matter, any asserted antinomy between matter and mind, between spirit and flesh, between God and His world. It is possible enough that some of the names and forms in which the principle is clothed may have reached the Jewish mind from extra-Jewish sources, Babylonian, Persian, and the like; or that in others we may see the survivals of primitive religious ideas. But the principle itself rested on a religious basis: we can see it emerging and developing through the conflict between the faith of religious men in their God and their experience of life in a world which had given admittance to sin. The struggle of the righteous after inward peace, and after the realization of Divine rule in the world, is reflected in the conception of powers independent of God which resisted and thwarted Him. And the more intense the struggle, the more real the opposing forces seemed to be. Also, the more real God became in Jesus Christ as a living and loving personality, the more real still became the personality of the foe. So that it is only to be expected that in the New Testament we should find this principle coming more sharply to expression than even in the Apocalyptic literature. And most of all in Paul, in whom the realization of the living and loving Christ, and of the moral struggle in which His followers were engaged, was so intense and so continuous.

Secondly, this dualism differs from what is commonly so termed in that it is conditioned and temporary. Paul does not give any indication as to how he thought it had begun, how there had come to be this rupture right across the Divine creation, invisible as well as visible. But he is well assured that it is going to end, indeed that its ending has begun. The 'rulers of this world' are already καταργούμενοι, forces which are being put out of action; and the end will not be until Christ καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν, *i.e.* till he has finally disabled these hostile powers. For 'he must continue to reign until he has put all enemies beneath his feet'; and the last which will be thus magisterially dealt with is death. The dualism of human experience will be at an end; for God will be all in all. And, as it is temporary, so is it conditioned. Once more, Paul does not say so, but it follows from the fact which is beyond question, that he and his fellow-countrymen never found this dualistic principle infringing in the slightest degree upon the traditional monotheism of the race. We must take care not to invent for these people difficulties which they did not feel. The metaphysical speculation of the Greek was entirely foreign to the Hebrew mind. If the Jew raised any question as to the origin of evil he found the answer in history,—so far as it affected humanity in the fall of one whom God had made in His own likeness —so far as it was manifested in a world of spirits, in a similar self-determination on the part of spirits whom also God had created, and who also had misused their freedom. Thus behind all this dualistic reasoning and expression, this recognition of hostile powers at issue with man and with man's happiness, there was always as an unbroken background the conviction of a sole Divine sovereignty, by which the action of the hostile power was tacitly conditioned. That being so, we shall perhaps have less difficulty in accepting the fact that these views did colour Paul's thinking and language. And that will help greatly to the understanding of his Epistles and of his theology.

This is to be seen in connexion with one matter of supreme importance, the explanation which Paul gave to himself and to others of the death of Christ, its necessity and its meaning. There is one element in that explanation to which ever since the time of Anselm authoritative exponents of Paulinism have failed to do justice; and that is Christ's struggle with and victory over the powers of darkness. Anselm performed what was at once an easy and a useful task in refuting crude notions of the death of Christ as a ransom paid to the

devil, and yet cruder notions that by a kind of trick the devil was cheated of his pay. But this left Paul's view, one side of it at least, still to be reckoned with. What we call the devil, what Paul calls 'principalities and powers' had in Paul's view a very important share in the meaning of the death of Christ. They were not bought off: they were beaten off. Humanity was in their toils. Christ, coming in the likeness of sin, flesh, entered so completely into human conditions that He incurred and felt their antagonism, their power to tempt, their murderous hate.[1] He fought them to the death, and when by the resurrection it was shown that they had done their worst on Him and failed, He triumphed over them, through death destroyed him that had the power of death. And men who by faith in Him come to partake in that death of His, die, as He did, from under the authority and dominion of these hostile powers, and live again as He did, emancipated from death and from the bondage of a nature which had passed into the power of sin.

And this suggests the answer to the question which may be put: how are we to relate ourselves to this mode of thought, so alien to our modern conceptions? Much of this crude belief in a spirit-world has long ago been dismissed as childish superstition. Can we recognize it in St. Paul and other writers of the New Testament, and still hold to our belief in their authority as religious teachers, their inspiration as from God? The answer is, certainly we can: provided we do not force their thinking into the pattern of our own; provided that we recognize such facts as have just been brought forward. For when we recognize the kind of forces which men felt to be their enemies and the great tyranny they exercised, when we recognize how completely and triumphantly Christ has dealt with them for the emancipation of His people, we ask what are the corresponding forces in our own time? Really and essentially they are the same. We give them abstract names because we think of them as abstractions. The Jew had no abstractions. For him every force took concrete shape, name and personality. What we call worldliness, he called the god of this world; what we call materialism, insolent self-absorption, godlessness, he called 'principalities and powers'; what we call the Zeitgeist he called the devil. And these things are real enough. They are the foes of God and man. To them men are in bondage, and their conventions weigh on the spirit of man as heavily as ever did the Law. Where we see cruelty and tyranny and lust embodied in individual men, the men who wrote our New Testament saw them disembodied, shall we say, as spiritual forces of 'wickedness in the heavenlies.' And what Paul has to tell us, amongst other things, is that with all these our Lord has fought the battle of humanity, that over them all He has triumphed, when, having stripped Himself of the flesh through which they attacked Him, He rose victorious from His struggle with death. All these forces which are holding man down, riding over him, like a car of Juggernaut, are καταργούμενοι: for those who are themselves in Christ, κατηργήθησαν; and what Paul would say to us is what he said to the Galatians, 'Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made you free.'

[1] Heb 2^{14}.

Recent Foreign Theology.

New Testament Handbook.[1]

This great *Handbuch* is now nearly complete. A great conception lies at the basis of it, and the working out of that conception into all its details is a worthy performance. The handbook will be complete in five volumes. The first volume is complete. Its aim is to place the New Testament in its historical environment. One part of it deals with the language. In the volume called *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, Dr. Ludwig Radermacher enables the student to see the Greek of the N.T. in the place which it occupies in the historical evolution of the Greek language. With masterly ease, with the highest scholarship, and with unsurpassed knowledge he deals with his problem. He uses all the material which has been made

[1] *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, in Verbindung mit W. Bauer, M. Dibelius, H. Gressmann, W. Heitmüller, F. Niebergall, E. Preuschen, L. Radermacher, H. Schlosser, P. Wendland, H. Windisch. Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann. Tübingen: Velag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

available by recent investigation, and disposes it in a way worthy of the highest admiration. Dr. Moulton in our own country, Dr. Robertson in America, and the works of Dr. Deissmann translated into English, have enabled the English student to become aware of the lie of the land in this sphere of scholarship. But the work of Dr. Radermacher has a place of its own. The wealth of new material from inscriptions, from papyri, from ostraca, as well as from the increased knowledge of the *Koine* derived from critical editions of *Koine* texts, has all been utilized, and with the most gratifying results. The work is both scientific and popular. The remaining parts of the first volume have already reached a second and a third edition. One is not surprised when one remembers what it was on its first appearance. It appeared under the title *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judenthum und Christenthum, und die Urchristlichen Literaturformen.* On its first appearance this work received a warm welcome from scholars of all lands. It covered the whole field, it traced to their sources all the influences that played on the world at the beginning of our era, described their development, and set forth a vivid account of the state of the world, in all its aspects, at the time of the beginning of Christianity. It gathered together the knowledge which had been scattered through many works, and set it forth in a way which entranced and instructed the student. Now these works appear in a revised and improved form. Dr. Wendland has taken note of all the scholarly criticisms which have appeared, and has considered his work in their light. He has also followed out into further detail what had been only sketched in the first edition, and the result is a treatise which every student must reckon with. It is impossible to note all the wealth which the author has placed at the command of the student. We wish that it may be made accessible to the English student at an early period. The other part of the first volume is also of great value. We are glad to note that in dealing with the Synoptic Gospels, Dr. Wendland again calls attention to the importance of the oral tradition; and, though he seems to us to undervalue it in some ways, yet his statement should call attention to the comparative neglect of this phenomenon in more recent criticism. Taking the first volume as a whole, or taking it in its separate parts, no more worthy contribution to the study of the N.T. has been made in our time.

The second, third, and fourth volumes of the handbook are given to scientific exegesis. They aim at giving the student an exact knowledge of the books of the N.T. They make use of every possible aid towards this end; nor is anything neglected that could in any way cast light on the text. As one turns over the pages of any of those commentaries, one will be struck first with the references to papyri, to inscriptions, to Greek writings of the time of the Empire, and to the necessary modifications which recent knowledge has made on the older grammatical exegesis. Next one will note the numerous parallels, more or less close, to passages in the N.T. There are other features which strike the student, and which make these commentaries somewhat out of the common order. The commentaries on Mark, Matthew, and John have already appeared, that on Luke will appear during the current year, and with its appearance the second volume will be complete. The commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles and on the Epistle to the Hebrews are also promised during the current year. Part of the fourth volume has already appeared, and the rest will follow in due time. But the greater part of this undertaking has been completed, and we have to congratulate the editor, the contributors, and the publishers on the excellence of their work, on the promptness with which they have accomplished their great task, and on the care they have taken to present their work in a form worthy of itself, and of their own reputation. The fifth volume, which is a practical exposition of the N.T. for preachers and teachers of religion, is complete. It is from the pen of Dr. F. Niebergall, and it really directs attention to the practical issues of the N.T. It is well done, and ought to be helpful to the preacher and the teacher. J. IVERACH.

Aberdeen.

Contributions and Comments.

Christ's Message of the Kingdom.

Owing to my temporary absence from Madras it was only a few days ago that your June issue came into my hands in which Dr. Eugene Stock pays my book on *Christ's Message of the Kingdom* the unexpected compliment of describing its contents in some detail. If I ask to be allowed, in a few words, to rectify one incorrect impression which Dr. Stock has inadvertently given, this is not due to any lack of gratitude for the service which he has thus rendered to the cause I had at heart in writing that book, but simply to a feeling that its power to further this cause would be injured if the impression I refer to gained currency.

Christian thought in general regards with justifiable suspicion any teaching which seems to avoid giving to the idea of propitiation a foremost place among the conceptions to be employed in interpreting the Cross of Christ. Now the exposition which I have attempted seems to me not only to emphasize the principle of propitiation, but at the same time to evade, in a surprisingly simple manner, the ethical difficulties which beset any substitutionary application of this principle, by taking the very natural step of interpreting Mt 5^{38-41} in the light of 5^{17}. If in His other new injunctions Christ's 'But I say unto you' introduces not something new but just the fulfilment or perfecting of the old law, then here too His purpose must be the same, namely, not to supersede the moral demand which expresses itself in retribution, but to give it a form perfectly adequate to its true nature. His meaning must be, not that the Christian is to abstain from enforcing the law of justice, but that true justice consists in the kind of conduct of which He proceeds to give instances—conduct which, so far from deserving the label 'non-resistance' which we commonly attach to it, is really the one transparently sincere and thorough way of assailing wickedness and repudiating it without compromise. How such conduct can have this value I have sought to explain in my book. Nevertheless I seem to have been so little successful in making clear the significance of the view suggested that even a careful reader like Dr. Stock is able to remark regretfully on 'the absence of any direct reference to "propitiation,"' and to do so immediately after quoting certain sentences which were intended to be nothing else than such a reference. In order to show, very briefly, how misleading this remark is, perhaps I may venture to formulate my real view quite roughly in four propositions.

i. There is no atonement unless the righteousness of God is manifested in so perfect a manner as to set His forgivingness above all suspicion of implying indifference to sin. Only so can He morally forgive, and only so can men morally accept His forgiveness.

ii. If punishment were a perfect—and the only perfect—manifestation and vindication of the righteousness of God in relation to sin, then there could be no propitiation without the exaction of penalty.

iii. But (*a*) the O.T. revelation, interpreted as a whole, teaches only that *some* satisfaction of God's righteousness is necessary, not that it must be one manifested through the exaction of an equivalent penalty (pp. 27–30, 91 *foot*, 186–7); and (*b*) Christ in the 'Sermon on the Mount' definitely teaches that punishment is not a perfect manifestation and vindication of righteousness in relation to sin, but that the only perfect manifestation is that afforded when the righteous will freely allows the evil-doer to wreak his pleasure upon itself and continues all the while to serve and befriend the evil-doer (pp. 90–97, 100 *middle*).

iv. Therefore any interpretation of Christ's death that describes it as a penalty exacted by God is an explanation which, although pointing in the right direction, falls short of adequately exhibiting the perfection of its propitiatory value; while an interpretation which regards it as God's act of self-surrender into the hands of sinners, whereby they are enabled to wreak their evil will freely and directly upon Himself who continues to love and serve them none the less, is an interpretation which for the first time exhibits it as a perfectly adequate propitiation, a great act wherein God has given free play to that need which resides in His nature to oppose and condemn sin to the uttermost (pp. 199–202, 204–206).

A. G. Hogg.

Madras.

Further Light upon Early Babylonian History.

In The Expository Times for April last (pp. 305 ff.), I gave a description and rendering in English of the tablet (recently published by Father Scheil) inscribed with the early list of Babylonian kings, and apparently an old copy of a portion of the now fragmentary, but originally complete list treated of by George Smith in 1874. Professor Scheil having succeeded in cleaning out the characters on the broken upper edge of the reverse of the copy published by him, has found there traces of the characters *Šar-ga- . . .*, which, he decided, 'without hesitation,' to be part of the name of the well-known king of Agadé, Šargani-šarri (as it is now read). This completion he has published in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, vol. ix. No. II. p. 69, with a fresh photographic facsimile of the text.

The tablet therefore has Šarru-kîn immediately before the gap, and Šargani after it, so that these two rulers were, as supposed by Menant, different persons. Narâm-Sin was therefore not the son of Šargani, but, as stated by Nabonidus, of Šarru-ukîn, the Šarru-kîn of the new list. This correction has naturally attracted the attention of M. F. Thureau-Dangin, who, in the same part of the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, p. 81 ff., makes some exceedingly important remarks upon this subject.

He shows how, from the occurrence of the name *Šarru-kîn-îli*, 'Šarru-kîn is my god,' on the obelisk of Manîštu-su, Šarru-kîn was probably the immediate predecessor of that king, and argues, from a similar name (*Îli-Uru-muš*, 'My god is Uru-muš'), that Uru-muš preceded Šargani-šarri and Naram-Sin (*Revue d'Assyriologie*, ix. p. 36).

From the obelisk in question and other documents (*ibid.* p. 82), M. F. Thureau-Dangin comes to the conclusion that the kings of Agadé to be inserted in the gap in the chronological list are as follow:—

Šarru-kîn.
Man-îštu-su, his son.
Uru-muš.
Narâm-Sin.
Šargani-šarri, grandson of Narâm-Sin.

It remains to find the lengths of their reigns, and therewith the confirmation of this order and relationship.

This to all appearance sunders Šargani from Sargôn (סַרְגּוֹן), the correct form of the latter being *Šarru-kîn* or *Šarru-ukîn*—not *Šarganu*, as the analogy of *lišānu*, Heb. *lāshôn*, 'tongue,' might lead one to expect. A popular etymology which regarded the old pronunciation as having been *Šar-gani*, may have derived the first element of *Šargani-šarri* from *Šar-gina*, but even if we admit the possibility that *šar*, 'king,' was used in Sumerian, the terminal *i* would be unexplained—*Šar-gina* (for *Lugalgina*) would suggest that the form should be *Šargana*, not *Šargani*.

Time alone will decide this question of etymology, which I am unable to discuss in all its aspects at present. Perhaps we have to admit, in the Hebrew form, a scribal error of ו for י, which, with the proper vocalization, would make *Sargên* or *Sargîn* instead of Sargôn. The rendering of Š as S in the Hebrew form follows the rule, and implies that the Hebrews first heard the name from Assyrian, and not from Babylonian, lips.[1]

I see that I have allowed two slips of the pen to pass in my article 'Light on Early Babylonian History.' On p. 306[a], line 35, the '(ii.)' after Ba-ša-Ensu should be deleted; and on p. 307[b], line 37, Sur-Bau should be Sur-Engur.

Theophilus G. Pinches.

London.

[1] Cf. T. G. Pinches, 'Notes upon the Assyro-Babylonian Aramaic Dockets,' in *Florilegium Melchior de Vogüé*, 1909, pp. 485 ff.

Entre Nous.

The Marginal Notes.

A protest has been made against the issue of an edition of the Revised Version without the marginal notes. On what grounds is the protest made? 'The marginal notes are an integral part of the Revisers' work, to which the Revisers themselves attached high importance; and to omit them involves a mutilation of their work which does great injustice both to them and to their readers. Since the publication of the complete Revised Version in 1885, we believe that not a single commentary has appeared, especially on the books of the Old Testament, in which a preference for many of the marginal readings of the Revised Version has not been expressed; and in view of this great and admitted importance of the Revisers' margins it is to be regretted that the University Presses should have taken what appears to us to be a retrograde step. By publishing, for whatever reason, an edition without these marginal notes, they are withholding from the public a most valuable help to the understanding of the Scriptures.' The protest is signed by Dr. Aldis Wright, Dr. Ginsburg, Dr. Cheyne, Dr. Sayce, Dr. Driver—all members of one or other Revision Committee—also by Bishop Chase, Dean Ryle, Dean Kirkpatrick, Professor Swete, and many others. The list ends with the names of Professor J. H. Moulton, Professor G. B. Gray, and Professor A. S. Peake.

It does not seem possible that any scholar should think otherwise than these scholars do. Without its marginal readings it is not the Revised Version.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. N. A. Fitzroy Bourne, Penetanguishene, Ontario.

Illustrations of the Great Text for October must be received by the 1st of September. The text is 1 Co 15^{58}.

The Great Text for November is Ro 15^{13}—'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.' A copy of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or of Lewis's *Philocalia of Origen*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for December is Jn 6^{35}—'Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.' A copy of Welch's *The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*, or of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Gem's *An Anglo-Saxon Abbot*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for January is 2 Ch 6^{8}—'But the Lord said unto David my father, Whereas it was in thine heart to build an house for my name, thou didst well that it was in thine heart.' A copy of Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for February is Dt 18^{15}—'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken.' A copy of Lewis's *Philocalia of Origen*, or of Agnew's *Life's Christ Places*, or of Welch's *Religion of Israel under the Kingdom*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

DEMCO

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY